DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 938 HE 004 811

TITLE	The Changing Face of Higher Education. Proceedings of the SREB Legislative Work Conference (22nd, Memphis, Tennessee, August 22-24, 1973).
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	Aug 73
NOTE	50p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; *Higher Education; *Institutional Role; *Post Secondary Education; Proprietary Schools; *Regional Cooperation; Undergraduate Study; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This document contains the prepared remarks given at the Legislative Work Conference (LWC) of the Southern Regional Education Board. The LWC concentrated on the changing face of higher education. The once traditional term higher education is now increasingly replaced with references to postsecondary education, with options for students multiplying rapidly and including everything from new programs in proprietary and occupational-vocational schools through post-doctoral education opportunities. The document is divided into 5 sections: The Roles of the Various Postsecondary Institutions (proprietary, community colleges, state vocational systems, undergraduate colleges); Needs and Demands in Education for the Professions; Student Fainancial Aid (state and federal responsibility, needs and resources in the South); New Forms of Regional Cooperation; Statements of the Governors of South Carolina and Tennessee. The document also contains a roster of the delegates. (PG)

ED 083938

The Changing Face of Higher Education

Proceedings of the 22nd Legislative Work Conference
Southern Regional Education Board

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 811

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083938

The Changing Face of Higher Education

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 22ND SREB LEGISLATIVE WORK CONFERENCE

Memphis, Tennessee
August 22-24, 1973

Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30313

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword v

"1973 State Legislation Affecting Higher Education"
Richard Wilson 1

PREPARATION FOR WORK: THE ROLES OF VARIOUS POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

"The Proprietary Sector"
Richard A. Fulton 5

"The Community Colleges"
Joseph P. Cosand 9

"The State Vocational System"
Joseph D. Godsey 10

"The Undergraduate Colleges"
Robert F. Herrick 12

NEEDS AND DEMANDS IN EDUCATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS

"Planning for Professional Education"
John Folger 15

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

"State and Federal Responsibility"
Joseph D. Boyd 21

"Needs and Resources in the South"
Jerry S. Davis 23

Comment
Senator Leonard Dunavant, Tennessee 26
Senator Russell Kirby, North Carolina 27

NEW FORMS OF REGIONAL COOPERATION

"Proposals for New Forms of Regional Cooperation"
Prince B. Woodard 29

"The Future of State Government-Higher Education Relationships"
Clark Kerr 33

GOVERNORS' STATEMENTS
Governor John C. West, South Carolina 39
Governor Winfield Dunn, Tennessee 41

Roster of Delegates 45

FOREWORD

For some time the higher educational enterprise has been oversimplified. To some, higher education still means the traditional residential four-year college, though every state is now criss-crossed with a complex network of educational programs and institutions of great variety.

The traditional term higher education is increasingly replaced with references to post-secondary education, with options for students multiplying rapidly and including everything from new programs in proprietary and occupational-vocational schools through post-doctoral education opportunities.

It is safe to say that there is growing confusion on the part of both students and the general public about the objectives of the many types of institutions that now exist. Current emphasis on career education is raising many questions for state and higher education officials and planners. Are post-secondary institutions established primarily to teach vocational skills? Do they exist for the benefit of the individual or should the curriculum be planned to meet the needs of society? How should students be assisted in deciding whether to enter traditional college programs, vocational or trade schools, or graduate schools? Does higher education have the responsibility for educating the "whole man?"

The 1973 Legislative Work Conference examined these and other issues of current concern under the title, "The Changing Face of Higher Education." Topic of the meeting, and the issues to be dealt with, were selected by the Legislative Advisory Council at its meeting in November, 1972. For two days, legislators from the SREB states considered various aspects of the critical issues, especially as they related to legislative concerns. Speakers for the sessions included governors, legislators and educators, some of whom are practicing administrators, some with state-wide responsibilities, and some representing national associations. Much time was provided for questions and discussions following each of the prepared remarks.

This Proceedings of the Legislative Work Conference (LWC) includes the prepared remarks heard at the Conference and some of the less formal presentations made during the two-day session.

Winfred L. Godwin
President
Southern Regional Education Board

The Changing Face of Higher Education

The new popularity of postsecondary institutions other than the four-year college or university, and a new emphasis on education for job preparation, are giving a new look to education beyond the high school.

For the last two decades changes in social, economic, and educational patterns have contributed to the new look as witnessed by increasing numbers of black students, women, and older students on the campuses of the nation. The growth in numbers of community colleges, proprietary institutions, and associate degree programs in four-year colleges, have all pointed in the direction of education for a clearly defined purpose.

Legislators from throughout the South discussed the legislative, financial and state planning ramifications of the changing face of higher education at the 1973 Legislative Work Conference in Memphis, Tennessee, August 22-24.

State legislation in the 14 SREB states in 1973 reflected many of the changes inherent in the region's approach to contemporary postsecondary education. Richard Wilson, Capitol Reporter for the Louisville Courier-Journal, reviewed this legislation for delegates.

"1973 State Legislation Affecting Higher Education"

by Richard Wilson
Capitol Reporter
Louisville Courier-Journal

With the exception of Kentucky, legislatures in 13 of the 14 member states of the Southern Regional Education Board have met this year. Their activities concerning higher education have been brief in some states, extensive in others—routine in some and complex in others.

As a result of these activities, many millions of additional dollars have been allocated for the South's publicly supported colleges and universities and a number of new programs have either been initiated or the planning for them approved.

But overall, it appears that there is a significant reduction this year in the volume of higher education legislation. I am also struck by the fact that much of the new legislation appears to be aimed at further tidying up state systems that have already assumed new levels of orderliness through creation or strengthening of state-level coordinating or governing boards.

As I have studied the legislative reports from these states, I have tried to detect any common legislative topics or particular problems not unique to any single state.

Other than the usual approval of new campus budgets—and in most states, capital construction funds—there appeared to be no single topic which commanded attention in each state.

But there were some common threads.

In the area of budgeting, there were at least modest increases allocated for higher education in

each state—and more than modest amounts in some. Arkansas even provided some "catch-up" funding for libraries and equipment on its campuses. The budget pots in several states were sweetened by the allocation of revenue-sharing funds to higher education.

I am not suggesting—and I'm quite certain that most campus officials would not accept the idea—that legislatures were overly generous in allocating new dollars for their campuses. I'm only saying that as one observer, I am surprised that the purse strings were not tighter.

Whether the funding is sufficient for the institutions to combat unexpected levels of inflation remains to be seen. In Tennessee the Higher Education Commission based its budgetary recommendations on a three-percent inflationary factor. As I'm sure John Folger and officials on the state's campuses will attest, this was a grave underestimate.

Other than budgets, I think if there was any single topic provoking discussion in several states it was tuition grants or loan programs for students attending private colleges. This topic commanded attention in seven legislatures.

Bills providing for varying types of assistance were rejected in West Virginia, Arkansas and Mississippi.

But in Georgia, $4.2 million was appropriated to expand that state's program to college juniors and Virginia took a new approach to its program which the courts ruled unconstitutional last year.

The Texas Coordinating Board received $12.5 million to provide stipends in its independent colleges. And in North Carolina, $4.6 million was allocated to provide a maximum of $200 a year for full-time residents attending private schools in the state. To be eligible, the private schools are required to match the state funds by providing similar amounts for needy North Carolina students.

Virginia revamped its legally unsuccessful program into two separate loan plans and appropriated $750,000 to support and administer them. If one or both of the programs pass expected court tests, only freshmen would be eligible for aid during the upcoming academic year and the maximum stipend would be $400 per student.

Under the state's private college tuition assistance act—for which $642,000 was allocated—any Virginia resident who is a freshman in a private, non-church college would be eligible. Under the college scholarship assistance act, Virginia resident freshmen in public or private colleges are eligible for assistance, based on demonstrated financial need.

Loans under both programs can be repaid by students through public service employment and other means after graduation.

An added legislative effort to assure legalization of the Virginia plan is indicated by passage of a resolution to amend the state's 1971 Constitution by unequivocally authorizing loans to private college students. This additional legal protection for the financial assistance programs becomes law only if the legislature approves the resolution in next year's regular session and it then wins voter approval later in a state-wide referendum.

The Maryland Legislature voted to include graduate degrees in a program of aid to Maryland's private colleges and universities operating on a formula devised in 1971. The formula provided for a state grant of $500 per baccalaureate degree granted the previous June and $200 per associate degree.

Aside from these programs, educational opportunity was expanded in other ways throughout the South. New junior or community colleges were authorized in several states and Arkansas formally created a new state community college system.

In Maryland, the formerly private University of Baltimore will become part of the state college system. The Louisiana legislature approved creation of a state-wide comprehensive system of career education, to be financed by a nearly $56 million bond issue.

New scholarship or loan programs were authorized and funded for needy medical students in Tennessee, Texas and Maryland. Recipients can work off their loans by practicing in medically-depressed areas in these states.

At least four states, however, narrowed opportunities for out-of-state students to gain an education within their boundaries. Louisiana added a provision to its general appropriations bill requiring reciprocal out-of-state fees at all state colleges and universities. This means out-of-state students could pay the same tuition at the Louisiana schools as Louisiana students would be charged in other states.

Tennessee's higher education budget envisions a $90 a year tuition increase for out-of-state students and non-resident fees in Maryland will go up $200 a year.

Maryland almost took another approach to cutting back its out-of-state enrollment. A bill was introduced to require the University of Maryland to

give state residents priority over out of staters for the 8,000 dormitory beds at the College Park campus. The measure was quickly and quietly dropped, however, after officials realized it would impede the University's recruiting of out-of-state athletes.

Virginia refined its policy governing non-Virginians' eligibility for state residency and lower tuition rates. At issue there—and in many other states—is whether an out-of-state student who registers to vote in his college community also makes him a state resident for tuition payment purposes.

I believe I'm right in that only a few cases on this question have been decided in the courts—and only in Michigan, where that case is on appeal—has a court ruled that residency for voting purposes is to be construed by public colleges and universities as residency for tuition purposes. A few weeks ago a Federal judge in Kentucky ruled that a state college does not have to permit non-Kentucky students to pay residential tuition by virtue of their having successfully registered to vote in the state.

In another tuition-related issue, North Carolina has altered its policy under which new residents can claim residency. Presumably in response to the U.S. Supreme Court's recent Connecticut decision, students from other states enrolling in North Carolina institutions can be granted state residency under certain conditions. Previously, any new resident in North Carolina could never qualify for the lower in-state tuition charges so long as they were in school. To qualify such a person had to drop out of school, but remain in the state for one year. Now a student can acquire resident status while in school.

In reviewing new legislation, it is also obvious that few legislatures are willing to approve expensive new professional education programs without first ordering feasibility studies to determine and justify their need. I base this observation on the number of studies commissioned in the various states this year.

At least three states—Tennessee, Virginia and Mississippi—have studies underway to determine the feasibility for new schools of veterinary medicine. A similar study is underway in Kentucky in preparation for an anticipated proposal for a new veterinary school there.

In a broader context, there also appears to be a significant concern in several states for increased production of allied health and medical personnel. Georgia's legislature has appropriated $5 million in "seed money" for a new medical school at Mercer University, a private school.

Florida has allocated $9 million for construction of Phase 2 of the University of South Florida's Medical School in Tampa. The Virginia, Tennessee and Mississippi legislatures have also made funds available for renovation of or additions to medical education facilities in their states. Mississippi has also authorized a new dental school.

No year of Southern legislative activity concerning higher education would be complete without at least a few controversial items. This year these items were proposed construction of two new medical schools, an attempted merger of two West Virginia colleges and legislative concern by Maryland legislators with the University of Maryland's fiscal autonomy.

In Tennessee, $100,000 was appropriated to plan a medical school at East Tennessee State University when and if Congress approves funding for a program to create eight new medical schools to be operated in conjunction with Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Both Governor Dunn and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission oppose creation of an additional medical school at state expense. They have contended that the University of Tennessee's Medical Units at Memphis need all currently available funding to meet accreditation standards.

In North Carolina the battle lines are forming between proponents of a four-year medical school at East Carolina University and others who oppose the proposal. ECU partisans are now awaiting a decision on the matter by the University of North Carolina System's Board of Governors. The Board will begin deliberations on the matter next month when it receives an outside consultant's recommendations on the issue. If the Board rejects the ECU proposal, that school's legislative supporters are expected to take their case to the 1974 legislature. This would be the first challenge to the Board's authority since it was created in 1971 to oversee the state's university system.

West Virginia's Board of Regents proposed merger of Bluefield and Concord Colleges, two institutions located 20 miles apart and each with enrollments of less than 2,000 students. The merger plan fell through, but both schools now have a single president. Presumably some of the estimated $400,000 annual savings expected if the merger had been approved will still be realized.

Legislators in Maryland became upset when the University purchased a $141,000 home for the main campus's chancellor. The purchase did not

necessitate legislative approval, although it was approved by the State Board of Public Works. A bill was finally introduced that would have subjected the University to line item budgeting. The bill won House approval, but later died in a Senate committee.

Virginia's legislature took a step this year which may merit consideration by a number of other states. To prevent unnecessary duplication of adult education and extension programs and efforts, the legislature divided the state into six "continuing education regions." It assigned the senior institution in each region the prime responsibility for coordinating all adult education programs within its region. Private colleges can join these consortia if they agree to follow procedures and regulations set by the Higher Education Council. Under the plan, community colleges within each region have primary responsibilities for freshmen and sophomore-level courses and senior institutions for junior, senior and graduate offerings.

These are the major items discussed in the region's legislatures thus far this year. Obviously there were many others, and I may have overlooked some issues that in your opinion were as significant as those I have mentioned. If so, you will have the chance to mention them.

In closing, I would like to note my surprise at the absence of one issue which I thought would have surely been discussed in at least one legislature. That is collective bargaining—an issue of increasing concern to many faculty members who feel their traditional interests are being threatened.

Salary increases are tightening, less money is available for projects they want and some critics want to increase their workloads and alter other conditions of employment. There is also a frustration within many academic circles concerning promotion and tenure policies.

Perhaps this was just not the year for this issue to hit the legislative hopper. But I seriously doubt that it will be absent from your deliberations in the years ahead.

PREPARATION FOR WORK: THE ROLES OF VARIOUS POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

An emphasis on education's responsibility to prepare its students for employment has resulted from the tighter job market faced by graduates of the 1960s and the 1970s. In asking for "relevancy of curriculum," many are asking for the nuts and bolts information that will make them employable in jobs available now and projected for the future. For many years the college degree was an "open sesame" to jobs in fields demanding the general education of the traditional institution. Increasing specialization in the job market and a need for training in versatility so today's student can change jobs several times during his career make the earlier degree outmoded in many cases.

"THE PROPRIETARY SECTOR"

by Richard A. Fulton, Executive Director
Association of Independent Colleges and Schools

I appreciate this unique opportunity to talk to a group of legislators who are not under the pressure of sometimes hurried and often harried committee hearings concerning a particular piece of legislation. I think it is fair evidence of the increased acknowledgement of the existence of proprietary education—though not necessarily of its efficacy or integrity—that I have the opportunity to share as a peer on a panel with other recognized elements of postsecondary education, including the community colleges, the state vocational systems and the undergraduate colleges.

Quite often the proprietary schools are relegated to a category of "nontraditional education." The work of the Gould Commission on *Non-Traditional Study* is an example. Until I looked up the meaning of traditional, I used to be rather incensed at such treatment by the rest of the education establishment. According to the dictionary, tradition means "the handing down of information, beliefs, and customs by word of mouth or by example from one generation to another without written instruction." Traditionalism is "to follow accepted tradition; the beliefs of those opposed to modernism".

If, then, the rest of the education community is traditional and hands down information by word of mouth or by example without written instruction, and is opposed to modernism—then I am indeed proud to represent the nontraditional increment.

Before I attempt to describe the role of proprietary institutions regarding work preparation and the response of these schools to the current problems of redefining postsecondary higher education and how, in fact, the independent schools do prepare students for jobs, let me first talk about what proprietary education is, and is not.

Too often, proprietary education is incorrectly conceptualized as a particular type of occupational education or a particular level of complexity of vocational offerings. While it is true that most educational institutions, which are proprietary in form, are generally involved with career occupational or vocational education, there are liberal arts and collegiate proprietary institutions. Actually, to be proprietary is merely one form of institutional governance. There are really only three basic forms of institutional governance. There are tax-paying institutions, that is, proprietary schools; there are tax-avoiding institutions, such as the private nonprofit colleges; and there are tax-consuming institutions which are the tax-supported public institutions, such as the area vocational schools, the community colleges, and the state colleges and universities.

According to a press release issued by the Federal Trade Commission there are 3.3 million people enrolled in proprietary vocational education

programs. According to the FTC, one in three persons in postsecondary education is enrolled in a proprietary school. Where the FTC got this figure I know not, but I am in no position to argue against it. Actually, my own constituency, which is essentially business schools with some 50 or 60 junior and senior colleges among some 500 institutions holding membership in AICS, currently enrolls somewhere around 150,000 students. I do not speak for all of proprietary education but only one small increment. There is, of course, the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, the National Association of Schools of Cosmetology, the Barber Schools, and although different in delivery systems, a number of proprietary schools are in correspondence education and are represented by the National Home Study Council.

I have been asked to describe how the independent schools or the proprietary schools prepare students for job or career entry or progression. I suspect the question really is: How do we manage to sell Chevrolets when, down the street at the community college or the state vocational school, they are giving away Fords. This is the question that continues to perplex many people in what used to be called higher education, but has come to be called postsecondary education, and what I think might be more appropriately called postcompulsory education. In fact, we may be coming to the point in political-social theory that all education after high school really, in a sense, is structured leisure-time activity. It may, indeed, be a distinct process from the acquisition of skills through training. More about that later.

As to the basic question, why do so many young high school graduates—more than has been generally suspected—pass up "low cost" public education to go to proprietary schools? This was the subject of a very interesting investigation by the Stanford Research Institute. Back in 1966, before proprietary schools became sort of the "in subject" for a proliferation of research reports, the question was put to proprietary school students in a survey of vocational education planning in Santa Clara County, California. Some of the responses are quite interesting. This U.S. Office of Education Study, Contract No. OE-5-85-068, found for example:

"'Here I don't have to bother with English composition, physical education, history or science,' said a girl enrolled in secretarial training. 'I spend all my time on business courses, and after all, that's what I need for a job.'

"Time (course length and ease of enrollment), placement service, individual attention, and relaxed classroom atmosphere were other major reasons mentioned.

"Podesta explains: 'Students begin classes when they want to and get to work much sooner than in public schools where they see courses added 'to drag out the time'. They feel the early paychecks compensate for high study costs.

"Instructional programs were similar to those of public schools, Podesta found. Students felt, however, that proprietary school teachers were 'closer to the job market, more aware of conditions, better able to help them find jobs.'"[1]

A current article by Welford W. Wilms in CHANGE Magazine, Summer, 1973, entitled, *A New Look at Proprietary Schools*, conceptualizes these students' reactions when he states:

> "The distinction between education and training isn't only an academic one. Education is a slow highly individual, lifelong process, training is not. Training can be done fast and effectively, provided that objectives are clear and resources are available.[2]
>
> "Until these two purposes of higher education—training and education—are clearly defined and understood, colleges and universities will probably not be successful in developing an educated and skilled person in four years. A real choice for some people should be to attend a program that provides only training and makes no pretense of educating the 'whole man'. At a later time in life when he is ready, the same student could take advantage of the educational options offered by colleges and universities."[3]

I realize in citing the Stanford Report and quoting from the writings of Mr. Wilms that such a viewpoint simply is not acceptable to some members of the community college establishment. This, for example, is borne out in the testimony given by a representative of the Los Angeles Community College System to the National Commission on the Financing of Post-Secondary Education, on which Dr. Cosand serves.

As I understand it, the L.A. community college spokesman simply would not accept the fact that it was appropriate for the skill training of beauty operators to take place without a concurrent increment of general education. The argument was that the beauty operator, in addition to the skills of cosmetology, had to have sufficient education to discuss items of topical interest with the client on a person-to-person basis. Hence,

courses in political science, literature, et cetera are an essential part of the community college program. Certainly, these educators are entitled to such a viewpoint. The student, on the other hand, seems to seek the training now, and may want the education later.

In like manner, the public vocational education system has been the subject of several research studies and some critical commentary that it may be too closely tied to the high school curriculum rather than that of postsecondary education. These conclusions and the research studies are all footnoted in the HEW Special Task Force Report, "Work in America," prepared under the auspices of the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, (Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 73-278).

I am not sure whether the continued success of the proprietary school is due to its technique of not requiring both education and training concurrently, or that it is postsecondary rather than high school level. But I do suggest that Mr. Wilm's remarks are most appropriate when he states in his article:

> "Proprietary schools are particularly well suited for the training function in higher education. They cannot survive if there is no demand for their graduates; accordingly, they strive to give the student a tangible skill. Satisfied employed graduates are often the most effective recruiting tool for a proprietary school, and one disgruntled class of graduates can cut into future profits severely. In order to ensure a demand for their graduates, proprietary schools must remain connected to the labor market, which in turn provides them with an internal yardstick for allocating resources. When a new market opens, a profit-making school has an instant incentive to shift resources from marginally productive programs to programs that will yield a greater return on their investment.
>
> "The public institutions present a different picture. Their survival is not necessarily dependent on their ability to train students but on their ability to manipulate the political process for their income—bond issues, referenda, state and federal budget allocations. They do not have the direct incentive to maintain a continuous connection with the labor market. Lacking that link which provides proprietary schools with an instant guide for allocating their dollars, public colleges must use other devices. Typically, last year's budget is used to determine this year's budget, representing a consensus among campus groups that influence expenditures—but those expenditures may be unrelated to changing employer and student needs."[4]

In the redefinition of postsecondary education, I suppose the question is fairly asked, Is there a place for proprietary education in the planning and coordination of postsecondary education?

Clearly, the Congress has said, Yes. The so-called 1202 Planning Commissions mandate that the members of these commissions include those who are representative of proprietary education. Although I would like to be optimistic in my predictions, I feel there is sufficient historical background to justify some elements of pessimism.

For example, there is a very thoughtful, decent man with good credentials who has served on a task force of the Education Commission of the States. He is a former college president. He now works for an "establishment-type" foundation in the Northeast. I don't want to demean him but I do feel that I can fairly quote in context a statement he made in good faith at a meeting of this task force. He said, "If state planning was better, there would be no vacuums left into which proprietary education could move because they wouldn't be necessary." In other words, proprietary education to him really remains a predatory type of activity that only exists because public education hasn't been doing the job.

This, of course, justifies the question, What do you mean by "public education"? If you define public education to mean custodial care which takes place on publicly owned real estate within publicly owned and erected monuments of brick and mortar, with publicly salaried teachers and administrators, then I suppose it really is of no use to try and plan state educational activity with regard to proprietary schools unless you are planning for their extinction.

On the other hand, if you mean public education as education for the public via whatever delivery system that is the most expeditious, efficacious, and economical, then we have a whole different set of possibilities and opportunities. I mean, for example, under contract training, as it has been carried out under Vocational Rehabilitation since 1921.

I realize that theory and practice are not one and the same. It is hard to explain to a teacher on the public payroll, who might suddenly be out of a

job because some administrator or planner has decided on the basis of sound budgeting and planning, that typing or second-year court reporting can be taught more cheaply, more quickly, and better under contract with a proprietary institution than in the community college, or the area vocational school. Hence politics as well as prejudices involve any policy implementation of the under-contract approach to education for the public.

Time does not permit an historical comparison of the "under contract" authority purchase of services practices of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, dating back to 1921, and the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962, with the lack of such activity and the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Suffice to say that where the law and the responsibility to use under-contract authority is reposed in a client-oriented agency, such as Vocational Rehabilitation, there has been extensive use of the concept. Conversely, under vocational education, which is institutionally instead of student oriented, there was absolutely no use of the under-contract authority for the first five years of the law, and only sparse utilization subsequently. Possibly, after a decade, we may see some new expansion, particularly if state legislators begin receiving some more realistic budget planning answers from those officially charged with administering programs.

On the other hand, there are a number of states where optimism is fully justified. For example, in New York and Pennsylvania students in proprietary schools have equal access to the state scholarship programs. Under the Education Amendments of 1972 there is authority, though unfunded, for the state incentives for scholarship programs. As I understand the law, these 50-50 federal-state matching scholarships would be equally available to students in proprietary institutions of higher education. I feel that on the basis of experience, where there has been a long history of affirmative state interest in the proprietary school sector, coupled with active membership in nationally recognized accrediting bodies, there exists a system of proprietary schools in that state which is a viable, tax-paying asset. There exists a realistic alternative for those seeking job training who may have failed in the public system, or who may have rejected the collegiate nature of other parts of postsecondary education.

As I stated earlier, it does seem that proprietary education has been "discovered." This leaves me with mixed emotions because there is a great deal of security in obscurity. The eskimos really didn't have much of a chance after the missionaries and the anthropologists got to them. I hope the proprietary schools fare a bit better.

Recently, someone asked Dr. Roger Heyns, President of the American Council on Education, what he thought about proprietary schools. His comment was most perceptive. He said, "They seem to be doing fine." His only concern was that "they would attempt to become like everybody else and thus get into the same set of problems that everyone else has."

Proprietary schools will continue to provide training for a larger segment of our population. That they are tax-paying and profit-making institutions is not the issue. The same questions should be asked of them as should be asked of any other institution, be it tax-avoiding or tax-consuming: Are you doing what you say you can do, and how well are you doing what you are doing?

Representative Edith Green, long a leader in federal education legislation, in an article, "The Educational Entrepreneur," observed:

> "We should not allow ourselves to be deluded by the categorization of companies into 'profit-making' and 'non-profit.' Sometimes we act as if 'non-profit' organizations are morally superior because, somehow, they are doing the job out of some high moral ideal—as if somehow it were immoral to make a profit. In fact, any organization has to receive enough income to cover its outgo, or it goes out of business."[5]

I suggest that the time is at hand for the state legislatures to take a closer look at what the proprietary schools are doing in order to plan how all types of institutions—tax-supported, tax-avoiding and tax-paying—can work together to provide education for the public in the most economical, expeditious, and efficacious manner.

---

1 An excerpt from Final Report, Contract No. OE-5-85-068 SUPPLY AND DEMAND FACTORS AFFECTING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PLANNING—A Methodological Study in Santa Clara County, California, October 1966, pp. 44-45.

2 *A New Look at Proprietary Schools*, by Wellford W. Wilms, CHANGE Magazine, Summer 1973, p. 7.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 7.

4 A New Look at Proprietary Schools, by Wellford W. Wilms, CHANGE Magazine, Summer 1973, pp. 7, 80.

5 *The Educational Entrepreneur—A Portrait*, Honorable Edith Green, The Public Interest, Summer 1972, p. 28.

"THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES"

by Joseph P. Cosand, Director
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Michigan

Far too many of our educators and citizens think of the two-year community college as it was before 1946 and are not aware of the major changes that have taken place in the educational program, in the philosophy, in the facilities and, of most importance, in the students. Before World War II there were not too many two-year colleges and most of them were primarily academically oriented junior colleges, located in California, and generally an appendage to a high school with little identity of their own. The facilities were "hand me downs" and both the students and staff tended to suffer from inferiority complexes.

The returning veteran caused changes to begin, and the changes accelerated during the following twenty-five years.

Today, there is a system of more than 1,150 two-year colleges of which at least 800 are comprehensive community colleges. These colleges are now located in all fifty states and enroll some 30-35 percent of the undergraduate students. The Carnegie Commission recommends that another 150 of these colleges be developed and that they enroll, by 1980, 35-40 percent and by 2000, 40-45 percent of all undergraduate students.

This growth is not due just to more college age youth but rather to the broad comprehensive educational program, to minimal tuition or no tuition, to accessibility, and increasingly to high quality student centered instruction. The Carnegie Commission in *The Open Door College*[1] has recommended that community colleges should be so located that 95 percent of the potential students would be within commuting distance. This applies to both youth and adults.

The community college catalogues all have similar statements as to philosophy and objectives and the statements give emphasis to four major objectives—if the college is to serve the community. The four are: academic preparation, occupational preparation, continuing education, and guidance. Carnegie's Open Door College report gives emphasis to these objectives and states: "Occupational programs should be given the fullest support and status within community colleges. These programs need to be geared flexibly to the changing requirements of society." Specifically the Commission recommends: "coordinated efforts at the federal, state, and local levels to stimulate the expansion of occupational education in community colleges and to make it responsive to changing manpower requirements." These statements of philosophy and objectives in the college publications and in the Carnegie reports give proof of the need for and acceptability of occupational education as an integral part of the total educational program of the two-year community college. The continued inclusion of an emphasis on the four objectives leads to the development of a college with *one* coordinated faculty serving the needs of *one* very heterogeneous student population in *one* high quality institution with equal attention and quality throughout all programs and facilities. In the fully developed comprehensive college there is no stigmatizing by program, facility, or in student or faculty status.

In order to have the occupational program responsive to changing manpower needs, it is essential for the college to have active and continuous input from the community served by the college. Many community colleges make extensive use of citizen advisory committees on both a broad and specific basis. I would recommend a broad overall advisory committee to evaluate constantly the total occupational program in terms of the changing manpower needs of the community—and of the adjoining regions. It is also of advantage to have four smaller umbrella committees in the following occupational fields: Business Services, Health Services, Engineering Technology and Public Services. These committees can look at more specific manpower needs within their areas of interest and can then recommend the establishment, modification, or deletion of a specific occupational curriculum. Each curriculum should have its own advisory committee composed of people knowledgeable of and active in the specific occupation. Advice from these committees is essential if the programs are to produce knowledgeable and skilled potential employees. An obsolete and out-dated occupational program is worse than no program at all. To maintain an unneeded or obsolete program is the grossest type of disservice to the students and is unworthy of any institution's faculty, administration or board.

The occupational program of community colleges will vary from perhaps a low of 20 percent of the students to a high of 90 percent, depending upon the location of the college and the students enrolled. No one college is going to be exactly the same as another college and, therefore, no overall occupational program should duplicate or emulate another. The breadth and depth of the total program must reflect the needs of the students to be served and the local, state and federal funding available. The program balance is essential if both scope and quality are to be maintained. There are too many instances where this balance has been thrown off through a lack of vision and effort—or through a lack of judgment in terms of real need and available funds. Overreacting, overreaching and overexpanding are just as unjustified as underdeveloping occupational programs.

The hundreds of comprehensive community colleges are scheduling among the various institutions hundreds of different occupational programs. These may require a very short period of time, six months, a year, or the full two years. Some students with subject or scholastic deficiencies will require additional time. There are new occupational programs developed every year, others are modified, and other are deleted. This is as it should be.

Boards of trustees must realize that many occupational programs are costly, much more costly than many of the traditional academic programs. This must be explained by the administration and understood by the total faculty, board and local and state governments. When understood in terms of the needs of the students, the needs of the community, the region and the state, support is generally forthcoming.

However, there is concern among the members of the legislative and executive branches of governments—both state and federal—about the duplication of effort and lack of cooperative planning among the various institutions and types of institutions engaged in occupational programs in the preparation of students for work.

The Educational Amendments of 1972 attempted to get at this problem through the formation of State Planning Commissions for Postsecondary Education—the 1202 Commissions. These commissions were to be representative of the general public and of postsecondary education. It was expected that representation would include those with knowledge of and interest in all the various segments of postsecondary education: technical institutes, proprietary schools, community colleges, state advisory councils, and the public and private four-year colleges and universities. The administration is increasingly interested in the "free market place" instead of state planning for fear of strong state administrative control. I believe that there can be both state planning and a free market place of institutions available to serve the diverse interests and needs of our very heterogeneous student population.

At the same time I am apprehensive about forthcoming state or federal intrusion into our traditional autonomy. This intrusion is most apparent and controls will follow if we do not as a group—as a totality—see the totality and the need for cooperative action within the framework of a cooperatively developed state plan for postsecondary education. We cannot permit the elimination of some of our strength through diversity. We cannot continue unjustified and costly duplication of effort. We cannot continue to be institution centered instead of student centered. We cannot be self-serving and through the lack of cooperation be forced into a controlling pattern which might well homogenize, lower the breadth of opportunities, and lower the quality of our preparation for work.

"THE STATE VOCATIONAL SYSTEM"

by Joseph D. Godsey, Director
Postsecondary Occupational-Technical Education
Texas Education Agency

It has long been obvious that conventional higher education is not meeting, in fact never has met, the needs of the majority of our postsecondary students, particularly when their interests and abilities are considered. Nationally, eighty percent of high school graduates do not achieve the baccalaureate or higher degree. In Texas, and I suspect the rest of the South, it is more than that.

When eight out of every ten high school graduates, not to mention high school dropouts, do not complete a four-year college program, something must be missing in our educational system.

In the past this "something" has been occupational-technical education and a suitable delivery system. I will state categorically that four-year colleges and universities are not suitable vehicles for two-year, or less, occupational-technical education programs. In my opinion, this accounts for the unprecedented growth during the last few years of two-year community junior colleges, technical institutes and area vocational schools. They are attempting to meet the requirements for occupational-technical education and in so doing are making it available in the community where it is needed. They offer programs to meet the interests of practically all students and, even more important, the programs are designed to take students as far as their ability level will permit and then exit with a marketable skill. Or, the students initially enter a one-year program compatible with their desires and ability.

At this point you might ask for a definition of vocational education and technical education; what are the objectives of each and what is a logical progression path for students? And, perhaps, why are occupational-technical programs out of place in the four-year college environment?

I like to think of conventional vocational education, occupational education if you please, as a program of study where fifty percent, or more, of the total program is devoted to skill development, i.e., competence in manipulative skills such as machinist, plumber, carpenter.

On the other hand, technical education is a program of study where fifty percent or more of the total program is in the cognitive area — mathematics, physics, chemistry and problems solution. And technical programs are usually two years or more in length. The technician is also quite competent in certain manipulative skills. A technician is the go-between between the skilled craftsman and the engineer. He works effectively with both.

Let's look at the objectives of any occupational-technical education program as operated in Texas.

All postsecondary occupational-technical programs in the public community junior college system of Texas, as well as the Texas State Technical Institute System, have one major objective, without exception: employment of the product. The program must be occupationally oriented in order to receive approval from my office. In other words, when a student completes a vocational or technical program of one semester or two years in length, that graduate can expect to go to work, usually in his area of training or a closely related one.

After completing a program and finding employment, the student's education and progress does not stop. On the contrary, it has just started. As he develops a requirement for additional training, or perhaps wants to move in a different direction, he can enroll in adult and continuing education courses specifically designed to upgrade competencies or develop new skills. An individual is limited only by his own ability, initiative and motivation.

The payoff in postsecondary occupational-technical education, the key point, is that completion of one of these programs puts groceries on the table in the shortest possible time. Although not generally recognized, this is a crucial point. Perhaps it will have more significance when you realize the average age of the community junior college student is 27.8 years. This contrasts rather sharply with the four-year college average age of 22 plus years. Obviously, many occupational-technical students are back in the community junior colleges as adults, upgrading their skills. In Texas about half of the community junior college vocational-technical enrollments are in the adult area.

It might be interesting to look at these enrollments and increases of the last decade. In 1963, prior to passage of the vocational education act of 1963, we had only token enrollments in vocational education programs in the Texas junior colleges. In 1973, in the spring semester, we had approximately 60,000 students in regular full-time occupational-technical programs and about 65,000 part-time adult students. We expect further increases in the vocational-technical enrollments and probably continued decreases in academic enrollments.

This is a quick look at occupational-technical education at the less than baccalaureate level and why this area of education is so important to so many of our citizens.

Now, I will present one important legislative problem that has developed in Texas during the last few years that you might find applicable in your own state. Since this is a legislative work conference, I think it is pertinent.

Dividing available tax dollars and setting priorities has to be one of the most onerous tasks that legislators face in discharging their constitutional duties. And they do remarkably well. But over a period of time undesirable situations do

develop as a result of legislative actions. The current problem in Texas in postsecondary occupational technical education is that we have four, or perhaps five, methods of funding post-secondary vocational education programs and they are not coordinated.

First, we have the regular community junior colleges established as a result of local option, with a local tax base. They receive line item amounts for vocational education programs to go with their local tax funds for operation of the programs.

Second, we have three community junior colleges established and operating where the local communities refused to vote a tax base for operation of the schools. Their vocational programs are operated with state funds only; line item amounts are appropriated by the legislature.

Third, we have the Texas State Technical Institute System. Its two-year and less vocational-technical programs are fully state funded. This includes total school administration and operation because they do not have a local tax base.

Fourth, we have a new phenomenon called an occupational skill center operated by a junior college but out of its legal district in another county. There are no local taxes for this center and a requirement for the school was not established by any survey of which I am aware. However, one million dollars was appropriated to start it.

Fifth, we have one fully state funded two-year postsecondary vocational-technical school operated by a university. It receives vocational funds.

It would appear that sooner or later someone is going to quesi n ntool while other schools and areas are receiving the same benefits without local taxes.

Our recently concluded regular session of the 63rd legislature did take cognizance of the proliferation of new schools and passed Senate Resolution 209 that declares a moratorium on creation of new senior colleges, universities and junior colleges. It also directs our coordinating board, state college and university system to make a study of postsecondary education requirements through 1980. Hopefully, the proliferation of post-secondary vocational education funding will also be addressed.

I have tried to give you a broad-brush look at postsecondary occupational-technical education and some of the related problems.

"THE UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES"

by Robert F. Herrick, Executive Director
The College Placement Council, Inc.

The charge to this panel is "to present fairly specific points on how the undergraduate colleges prepare, or should prepare, their students for job or career entry or progression."

Let me be completely candid at the outset in suggesting that there is so little of this being done in higher education that its absence constitutes a national disgrace. This is not to say that career planning and placement cannot be done or, indeed, is not being done to the full effect in some colleges and universities. The tragedy is that hundreds of thousands of our young men and women annually continue to stumble into the world of employment with costly consequences to themselves and to our economy. Indeed, the reason that organizations are raising questions such as we have before us today is that the absence of sufficient jobs dramatizes a shortcoming that long existed but was camouflaged in the 60s.

In that decade there was an excess demand for the college graduate and a willingness — indeed a necessity—on the part of business, government and industry to shoehorn graduates into ill-fitting occupations and hope to turn them into productive employees through on-the-job training. The result was that, even in those frenetic years when the college graduates seemed to have the world on a string, some 50 percent of them were leaving their first (and often their second and third) employer in the immediate years following graduation. In addition to the toll taken in the disruption of individual lives the cost to employers who expended an estimated $3,000 to attract, retain and render productive each graduate hired was tremendous. This was especially true if the graduate left after one or two years and the whole process had to begin again.

In facing the question of how colleges and universities should prepare their graduates for rewarding careers in terms of individual fulfillment I hope that we can avoid some traditional stumbling blocks. One of the contentions is that

any providing of career planning and placement to the college graduate is "vocationalism" and a profaning of the educational process. Another is the generalization that career planning and placement is acceptable only as a step-child of personal counseling. A third is the position that higher education, dedicated to the "life of the mind", has no concern for the transition from gown to town and, indeed, may properly lower the sheepskin curtain on the day of graduation and blink responsibility for what happens thereafter.

It is my contention that these philosophical arguments lead only to an unnecessary polarization. Higher education can and should accept responsibility for preparing its graduates by and large for the reality of entering into a life pursuit which is at once a demanding, and hopefully rewarding, commitment. This process should include making known to students the broad range of career options offered in the 20th Century and assisting them in the development process of career refinement. What it does *not* mean is thrusting them into the straitjacket of preconceived employment with a preconceived employer. Just the opposite!

The fact is that on those campuses where a conscientious program has been mounted to prepare students for rewarding careers, effective techniques *have* been developed. The time requirements and the costs have been shown to be moderate. But this is an era when college administrators are being pressed to cut every possible cost. Avoiding the spending of additional time and money to protect students from what is all too often a traumatic experience in the transition to the world of work is a tempting economy since the trauma is out of sight and out of mind. Now, however, the chickens are coming to roost. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported in February that of 1.1 million 1970 and 1971 graduates, 50.7 percent went into first jobs that were not directly related to their field of study. Of those receiving bachelor's degrees, 58.8 percent were not related to their major. In the specific instance of social science majors, 75.5 percent took posts not related to their training. This, of course, is in addition to the difficulty experienced by most graduates in obtaining employment at all. The College Placement Council's studies in the past college year have shown a 32 percent increase in recruitment of engineering students, a 33 percent increase for students engaged in sciences, mathematics and other technical areas, and a 22 percent increase for those majoring in business subjects. More significant is the fact that in other nontechnical areas there is a drop of 1 percent. The sought-after engineers represent some 5 percent of the graduates while the unsought nontechnicals constitute something in the range of 65 percent of the class.

Since I am quoting our Council's figures here, I shall say a few words concerning the organization which I represent. It is a nonprofit corporation whose membership is made up of the career planning and placement officers of the colleges and universities of the nation and of the college relations directors in business, government and industry. As such, it sits at the crossroads between higher education and the employers of the graduates of higher education. It conducts the national salary surveys and sponsors, through its CPC Foundation, research on the utilization of college-trained manpower. Its *Journal of College Placement* provides the authoritative literature of the field and some 400,000 copies of its *College Placement Annual* are provided free on over 1,000 campuses yearly. Its adjunct organization, College Placement Services, has made substantive contributions to the establishment or upgrading of career planning and placement operations on traditionally minority campuses. We do not deal with teacher placement as that is the field served by the Association of School, College and University Staffing. We have customarily, worked with the four-year college and university, although as career planning and placement have begun to emerge at the junior and community college level we have offered our services there also.

But, to return to specifics, let me cite some others.

Recommendation No. 31 of the recent report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education states, "Colleges and universities should take immediate steps to strengthen occupational counseling programs available to their students."

A Task Force established by HEW under the chairmanship of Frank Newman strikes a similar note when it says, "The first step in adjusting to these new realities would, at most institutions, be an overhaul of their placement officers for the graduating seniors."

Throughout the land, student impatience with the indifference of higher education to the realities of the employment market is paralleled by the concern of trustees and legislators for accountability in terms of supply and demand.

Dr. Felix Robb, who needs no introduction in this area, comments, "Regardless of how it is

handled, career assistance for individuals must be created and delivered by the educational system. It would seem that some colleges scarcely have a placement service at all and numbers of our larger universities are woefully inadequate in this important function."

Thomas Devlin, in a paper presented to the American College Personnel Association conference in Cleveland recently, revealed the results of a study which speaks to Dr. Robb's point. A total of some 1,500 questionnaires were sent to placement offices listed in our CPC Directory. Of these only 51 percent responded, suggesting that a high percentage of nonrespondents had nothing to report. But, of 776 usable replies, only 10 percent were offering career development courses as part of their academic program. Another 15 percent were in the planning stages of proposing such a course.

With all of these warning flags flying—some of them lofted by its own agencies—it would have seemed logical for the Federal Government with its expressed enthusiasm for vocational counseling at the high school and postsecondary level to have aided the plight of the hundreds of thousands of four-year college students—generalists in particular. The funding for increased career planning and placement services on college campuses would have been a relatively modest expenditure.

In the Education Amendments of 1972, Congress chose to vote some $850,000,000 over a three-year period to achieve, among other things, support for career planning and placement in postsecondary institutions. This is highly commendable. But the same legislation specifically excluded all baccalaureate degree candidates. This represents a de facto disenfranchisement of something approaching a million undergraduates of four-year institutions in terms of career planning and placement—and at the very time when they need it desperately. One wonders why, in its zeal to break the lockstep from high school into the four-year colleges, the government has found it necessary to write off the career needs of the baccalaureate candidates completely.

Let me close these remarks with a summation and some first-person generalizations gathered from 17 years of observation.

1. It is of the utmost importance that colleges and universities abandon postures of disinterest or noninvolvement in what happens to their graduates after commencement.

2. In an increasingly complex world, with increasingly manifold options, the student must be strongly motivated, or even required, to begin thinking about reducing those complexities and narrowing those options far before the senior year. The saddest thing our practitioners see is the student who comes to the placement office in the Spring of the senior year (for the first time in four years) seeking a job—any job. And this is without the slightest comprehension of what is required, what is offered, or the odds in favor of employment. There is ample evidence that employers flock not to campuses where students evidence such disorientation but to those where graduates have reasonably defined and practical career aspirations.

3. Examples abound of colleges and universities which have demonstrated, through individual and group counseling in the early years that students *can* be prepared for the transition to employment. But it requires an enlightened administration and support in terms of staff and program. It is here, especially, that a relatively modest outlay of federal funds could yield disproportionately excellent results.

4. Career planning and placement is a field unique unto itself. Personal counseling is unique unto itself. The two can and should work synergistically for the well-being of the student. But one cannot be made the stepchild of the other without jeopardizing the effectiveness of the total program.

5. And finally, over some half-century of experience, some career planning and placement offices have developed highly effective programs which they have shared through our professional publications. These models have shown the capability of moving swiftly and effectively into programs of counseling, out-reach, alumni service, employer relations, and career entry and progression. That relatively few institutions have combined *all* of these elements into programs of broad effectiveness is not for a lack of know-how. Rather, it reflects a lack of priority at too many colleges and universities—tragically most often at those where the students are least sought by the employing world and least prepared to enter it.

Which is to say that such programs should have been available long since and that they have been and are being implemented in selected instances. I hope that we can concern ourselves here with the means of making their accomplishment universal.

NEEDS AND DEMANDS IN EDUCATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS

Among the most noticeable changes in postsecondary education are those concerned with education for the professions. Changing patterns of delivery for health care have effected the preparation of nurses, doctors, dentists, allied health personnel and others concerned with health and medical training. Changing demands for lawyers, and uneven demands for engineers, depending upon their training and specialties, have made the study of future and current manpower needs vital to future planning for education for the professions.

"PLANNING FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION"

by John Folger, Executive Director
Tennessee Higher Education Commission

There are plenty of indications that a new day is here in higher education, but the views of the prophets are highly variable. To use a trite phrase, there is good news and bad news. Consider the following headlines from Tennessee papers in the last month:

"Future Bright for Veterinarians"
"Dream Caving in as Ph.D's Scrape for a Living"
"Higher Education Boom Has Ended"

The bad news seems to outweigh the good, but the news media help create these impressions. One Ph.D. out of ten thousand graduates who drives a taxi is a news story, but the decline in the unemployment rate for engineers from 2.5 percent to 1 percent doesn't get the same attention.

The fact is that prospects are highly variable for persons entering different fields; some are already overcrowded, others are likely to be overcrowded in the near future, and still others provide good job opportunities for the next decade or more.

Recognizing the fact that job prospects and student interest vary widely from field to field, the SREB has commissioned a series of studies by experts on the problems, trends, and prospects in some of the larger and more important areas of professional training. These professional fields include some of the more expensive and politically sensitive fields such as medicine, veterinary medicine and engineering, as well as some of the new professions such as computer science and allied health fields. These studies provide very useful planning data for any state considering problems of expansion or cutbacks in any fields.

I'm not going to try to summarize these papers. Instead, I want to talk about the issues in planning programs today, issues that face you in your own states.

Any state considering whether or not to expand or contract professional programs has several things to consider. We often fail to consider all of them, and may, as a result, reach the wrong conclusions about what we should do.

A first consideration which legislators, state planning officials and college presidents have always been sensitive to is the interest of students. How much student demand is there for the program? If students want a program, the general approach of college presidents and faculties has been that they should provide the program; and if excess student demand exists in any field, like nursing, that new programs should be started, or existing ones expanded to the point where all qualified applicants can be admitted. In recent years, this idea that all qualified students should be admitted, has been stimulated by a second closely related concern—that there be equality of educational opportunity.

This concern for equality of educational opportunity means that not only those students well-qualified academically and financially able to pay for the program should be considered, but also that those less qualified should be given a chance to qualify themselves, and those with less money should be given financial aid. The national efforts to provide equality of educational opportunity have

been a major influence on increased enrollment and on bigger student demand for entry into the professions.

A second consideration in planning professional programs has been the job market. Are more graduates needed? During the fifties and early sixties there was generally a good job market in most professions. We needed more teachers, college professors, computer programmers, nurses, doctors and engineers. Almost any field provided a good opportunity for the graduate, so picking out the right field where good job opportunities existed wasn't so important in 1960 as it has become in the 1970s.

Students are generally smarter and more sensitive to job market possibilities than we give them credit for being. As the demand for college teachers leveled off and prospects for Ph.D. graduates weren't so good, students in large numbers began to shift their career goals toward the professions, toward medicine, law, other health professions, psychology and business administration. Applications and student pressures have built up dramatically in these fields, while enrollment has leveled off or declined in some of the traditional graduate education fields like Chemistry or English.

It is a mixed market, but the student demand for entry into most of the professions is at a high level.

A third consideration which faces legislators and state planners is the migration of graduates and the problems of getting the right kind of graduates in the right locations. Tennessee, for example, has been producing more doctors than any other Southeastern state for many years. It has graduated enough to meet the state's needs for physicians, but has been exporting over 2/3 of them and has not got nearly as many from other states. We have an unfavorable balance of trade, and in addition our physicians, as well as yours, have settled in the cities near the big hospitals, and a very serious shortage of physicians exists in small towns and rural areas. Until we identify the causes of these distribution problems and do something about them, just training more health professionals for export to richer Northern and Western states won't solve our problems. I want to return to this issue later.

The final consideration I want to mention is cost. As the cost of education and professional training has expanded, legislatures and governors have become more concerned about accountability and have become much more cost conscious. They are interested in cutting down on costs, and in seeking more economical ways of doing things. At the same time, they can often be persuaded to push ahead with some new project even though it will be very costly. For example, several states, including Tennessee, Texas, South Carolina and West Virginia, are considering the establishment of additional state-supported medical schools which will all prove to be expensive projects, if they proceed with them. It will take a lot of cost effectiveness in other areas to offset the expenditures for projects like these.

Let me turn briefly to the key planning problem in professional education: How do we combine information about student demand, the job market, costs and distribution problems to reach a good decision about whether or not to expand, maintain or cut back on professional programs?

The problem is made more difficult by the rapid rate of change and the poor record we have of predicting the future with any accuracy. When you are considering several rapidly changing variables, some of which may change in unexpected directions, it is analogous to trying to find a good fishing spot in the ocean on a foggy night when you're out of sight of land. For example, demand for professionals in the health fields may be changed dramatically by new scientific discoveries, new technological developments and new systems of financing health care through national health insurance. Trying to adjust our planning to all these uncertainties is difficult, and often we do a bad job of predicting the future.

In spite of this difficulty, decisions must be made and programs started or stopped. And it's a lot easier to start a program than to stop or change one dramatically. There is more truth than fiction in the old saying that it is harder to change a curriculum than to move a graveyard. Planning can help guide this process, especially if we understand that we must maintain as much flexibility as possible and be prepared to adjust our plans frequently to changed conditions.

Let me illustrate some of the planning problems in the professions with materials from the SREB studies and some of our experience in Tennessee.

One of the biggest planning issues we have is in deciding how much weight to give student demand for professional training and how much to the job market opportunities. This becomes a problem only when one factor says expand, and the other says cut back.

Pharmacy provides a good example of one type of dilemma. In Tennessee, we have one pharmacy school, which up to 1971 accepted about 100 students a year, and graduated 80 to 95 pharmacists a year. We have about as many pharmacists per 100,000 people as the national average and have been training slightly more pharmacists than there were job openings in Tennessee. It is relatively easy to find a pharmacist if you want to hire one, and the signs indicate that the supply of graduates is in pretty good balance with the demand. During most of the sixties, the student demand was also in pretty good balance with the 100 spaces available and we were able to accommodate nearly all the qualified students from Tennessee who wanted to study pharmacy.

Suddenly, in the last two years, student demand has increased dramatically. This year there were over 250 qualified applicants for the 110 spaces now open (to qualify for federal funds we expanded the school 10 spaces). The Dean and Chancellor of the Medical Units are now getting calls from legislators wanting to get their qualified constituents admitted. Pressure for expansion to get more of the qualified students admitted is building up. If we were to expand to admit 150 students, the cost of the school would be increased about 50 percent and in three or four years we would be graduating substantially more pharmacists than could find a job in Tennessee, and perhaps anywhere. Should we expand to give more students an opportunity to invest four years of time preparing to enter a profession where the job opportunities are likely to be rather poor when they graduate? Expansion of pharmacy education is expensive; in Tennessee we are appropriating about $3500 per student per year, and many states spend substantially more.

Pharmacy seems to be a rather clear-cut example where we should not expand in Tennessee, even though this will mean that some students will have their goals to become pharmacists thwarted, and not every qualified student will be able to study in the field of his choice.

Let me turn this same issue to veterinary medicine, a field where the picture is more complicated. Dr. Bailey has recently completed a restudy of the field of veterinary medicine for the SREB, and his study has been widely distributed. He recommends against starting any more veterinary schools in the region on the grounds that the two new schools, LSU and Florida, when their graduates are added to the graduates of the four existing schools in the region will be adequate to improve the supply of veterinarians to achieve a level of veterinary service in the South consistent with the goals of the national study of veterinary education. Dr. Bailey acknowledges that there are a lot more students who want to go to veterinary school than can be accommodated, but he does not feel that student demand is an adequate justification for starting another school.

At the present time, there is considerable interest in further expansion of veterinary training in several SREB states. Texas has authorized, but has not funded, a second veterinary school at Texas Tech. Mississippi almost authorized a veterinary school in the last legislature, and wound up with a legislative committee studying the problem. Tennessee and Virginia have legislative committees studying the most feasible ways of expanding veterinary training, and the University of North Carolina has been studying the feasibility of a school for several years.

The high level of interest illustrates some of the dilemmas of planning for this field. In the first place, neither of the new schools is yet ready to take any regional students, and it may be 1975 or 1976 before more spaces are available. Even then, the number of additional spaces that any one state can expect to get is very modest—we are talking about dividing about 70-75 spaces among 9 states—each of which has 2 to 3 times as many well qualified applicants as can be accommodated under its regional quota. In Tennessee this year we had over 80 qualified applicants and 23 students were admitted. Two of these were from outside the region.

To the pressure from qualified students we can add the pressure from agricultural and other interests concerned about the present shortage of veterinary services. There is no doubt that veterinary services, particularly for large animals, are inadequate at the present time in the nation, and in all of the SREB states. Projections of the number of graduates from existing schools and the two new regional schools suggests that we will reach the nationally recommended level of veterinarians between 1990 and 2000, which is a long way off. Probably more people can make a living in pet care than is indicated by the nationally recommended number of veterinarians, since the national recommendations focused on public health and food animal needs for veterinary services. In short, there is a big backlog of demand for veterinary services and it will take at least two decades, and maybe longer, to satisfy them.

Dr. Bailey is probably right in the long run, but in the short run, which is where politicians and public officials have to act, we still have high student demand and high demand for the services of veterinarians. If we could wave a wand and have another school in operation this fall in the South it would help alleviate a lot of short-range problems that face most of our states.

Unfortunately, the establishment of a new veterinary school is a medium- to long-range proposition, and quite expensive. The average time from initial legislative authorization until the first graduates to enter practice will be about 12 years for Florida and LSU, and while in theory, it ought to be possible to plan, build, and produce the first group of graduates in 7 to 8 years, in practice the complexity of starting a new school suggests that 10 to 12 years is a more realistic figure. By the time another new school could be planned, built, and produce graduates for the job market, the veterinarian shortage will be considerably reduced.

It would certainly be a mistake if several states were to move ahead with plans for veterinary schools, thus abandoning the regional concept, and in the very long run (by the year 2000 and after), producing graduates who would have rather poor job opportunities. If you think it couldn't happen in veterinary medicine, I ask you to look at engineering where the severe shortages of graduate engineers in the 1950s and 1960s produced a rapid expansion of programs, students and graduates, so that the number of engineering doctorates graduated nationally increased from 950 in 1961 to 3800 in 1972—a quadrupling in eleven years. You would have had a very hard time selling any responsible officials in 1962 on the idea of a surplus of doctoral level engineers in the foreseeable future. Yet, a decade later Ph.D. engineers were having trouble finding jobs related to their training. I'm not predicting a surplus of veterinarians in 1983 or 1993, but by 2003, they might be having a hard time finding a practice location where they could earn a good living.

Let me turn now to another type of planning problem, as represented by Human Medicine.This field is the most important, most expensive and most complex of the professions. The number of qualified applicants has increased enormously in the last three or four years as more and more young people seek to enter this prestigious and high-paying field. Political pressures for expansion and for the accommodation of more students exist in most SREB states. States have expanded opportunities to these pressures. The number of doctors graduating nationally each year has increased from about 8000 in 1966 to about 11,500 in 1973, and is projected to increase to about 16,000 by 1980, based on firm plans for new schools and expansion of existing schools. In the South, three new schools have been started, and two more have been approved and funded in the last five years. At least a half dozen others are in the discussion stage. (Any plans for expansion which aren't firm by now won't produce any graduates before 1980 anyway).

The doubling of the output of our medical schools will be sufficient, in the judgment of most medical educators, to produce an adequate number of physicians to meet the nation's health care needs in the long run. But again, in the next two or three decades, we are likely to continue to have serious problems. The planned expansion of training alone won't be enough, however, because all of our states have a serious problem of distribution. Tennessee statistics illustrate the problem: We graduated about 320 doctors this year and, by the end of the decade, will be graduating nearly 400 according to the present expansion plans of our three schools. We have openings for only about 280 interns and residents each year in the state, and so some of our graduates have to leave the state for their specialty training and we get very few of them back. Only about 100 of the 280 Tennessee residency openings are in a primary care field like family medicine, internal medicine, or pediatrics. Thus less than one-third of our medical graduates have a chance to enter a primary care residency in Tennessee, and unless they do enter this type of specialty they are almost certain not to practice in a small town or rural area—which is where our biggest doctor shortages exist.

The nation as a whole, and the other states of the South, have a similar problem with too small a percentage of residency training opportunities in primary care fields.

Therefore, a first step is to expand our residencies in primary care specialties in Tennessee and get them spread across the state in more geographic locations. We hope to add 50 to 100 of these residencies in the next few years.

A second problem is that residents trained in a big metropolitan hospital learn to practive medicine in a specialized institution but they don't learn much about medical care in small towns where the facilities and the delivery of care are quite different. Therefore, we are developing some

primary care centers in small towns in Tennessee, and we want to develop part of the resident training for primary care physicians in these primary care centers. We think this will be an important step in getting doctors oriented toward small town practice.

A third step we are taking is to have an organized recruitment program, with financial incentives for students to locate in medical shortage areas.

We believe that all three of these steps are necessary to achieve better retention and distribution of our doctors, and that the failure of state efforts in the past has been that they attacked one part of the problem without taking a comprehensive approach.

In summary, a lot of attention has been given to the shortages of health care professionals in the last few years. There have been active recruitment efforts to get more high school students interested in careers in the health fields. These efforts have led to the tremendous expansion in the number of applicants to nearly every health care field. A large number of students' career ambitions are going to be frustrated, including many that could succeed in their hoped-for profession. This, in turn, leads to pressure to start new programs and expand existing ones. But if we succumb to all these pressures, sooner or later there will be more graduates than can find suitable jobs. In some fields, such as medicine and veterinary medicine, the over-supply of the field is a long way off in the future, but in fields like pharmacy and nursing an over-supply may become evident in the fairly near future if there is much more expansion.

This is not to say that *no* further expansion of health professions training is needed anywhere, for there may be situations where additional programs ought to be developed. This is simply to indicate that if we don't examine all of the factors carefully some serious and costly overexpansion may occur in the next decade.

Any review of planning for the professions needs to consider the possibilities for training paraprofessionals, and personnel with lesser educational qualifications who can provide some of the services for scarce professionals. Dentistry provides an excellent example of a field where manpower shortages can be reduced more quickly and at lower cost by training more dental assistants and new kinds of assistants than by starting new dental schools to train more dentists. The study "Dentistry in Transition" by Dr. Dunbar which was done for the SREB provides an excellent discussion of the possibilities for training assistants to do more of the dentist's jobs, thus making it possible to provide more dental care. The study also identifies some of the problems of gaining acceptance for new roles for dental assistants and how some of the resistance can be overcome.

Basically, we now have enough dentists in urban areas to take care of the effective demand for dental care where effective demand is defined by the willingness of private patients to pay for it. As long as dentists aren't being pressed to provide more service than they can provide with current practice arrangements they don't have incentive to do things more efficiently, or to allocate new functions to new types of dental auxiliaries.

However, there is a big backlog of unmet dental need because poor people will put off or do without adequate dental care simply because they can't pay for it.

If we move to a national health insurance program which includes dental care, then a big backlog of need will suddenly be transformed into effective demand. At that point, the most feasible way of meeting the demand will be to train new kinds of dental assistants who are allowed to do more of the dentist's work, under his general supervision. This will require the support of the dentists, who will be employing the new professionals, and it will require modification of the dental practice Act in most states.

The alternative to more and better dental assistants is more dentists. To produce more dentists will cost far more, take longer to develop the new schools and longer to train the dentists.

Similar issues exist in the field of medicine, as well as in several other fields, and any adequate planning for professional education must take account of the possibilities of subprofessional training.

One of the SREB studies is "A Strategy for Allied Health Education in the Southern Region" by Dr. Joseph Hamburg of the University of Kentucky, and he discusses a very important dimension of professional planning.

Engineering is another field where the use of technicians has greatly expanded. The number of graduates from professional engineering programs at the baccalaureate level has expanded very little in the last decade, but there has been a very large increase in the number of engineering technicians who have graduated. In addition to the engineering technician who works under the supervision of a professional engineer, many administrative and sales jobs can be performed by

persons with engineering management or engineering technician training. Thus our educational system has begun to train a wider variety of persons for the wider variety of engineering and engineering related jobs that are available today. The development of newer, shorter and less expensive training programs in the engineering field is a functional and economical way to meet the needs in engineering.

Engineering is also a field where student demand has dropped off because of the unfavorable job prospects. It now appears that a new shortage of engineers may develop in the next two decades when the reduced number of graduates enters a job market which is expected to expand.

As you can see from these illustrations, planning for the professions is a complicated business with many factors which have to be considered in working out the best answer for a given state. If you want to avoid unnecessary expansion of facilities, programs and costs, and at the same time provide educational opportunities for your citizens and meet your state's needs for trained professionals, the best thing you can do is have a careful study made by disinterested experts. Be sure they have considered the major variables and be skeptical of the quick answer and the over-simple solution. In the final analysis, you, as legislators, will have to pass on the proposals that are submitted to you when you look at the budget requests, but before that time you should insist that a good analysis of the problem has been made and that a solution is being proposed that considers all parts of the problem.

Every state in the region can get help from the SREB in planning and conducting educational and manpower studies. And the studies the Board has done of these professional fields can be a valuable resource.

Each state in the region also has a governing or coordinating board staff that is legally responsible to you and the Governor for planning, for analyzing problems, and for bringing in recommendations about professional program expansion or contraction. You should utilize this capability and insist on a thorough analysis and justification for proposals for expansion or contraction of professional education. We are in a much better position today than we have ever been in the region to give legislators the kind of information they need for informed judgments and decision making. The problems are complicated, but there is much more capability to analyze and solve them than ever before. I hope we can use it for the benefit of the people of the region.

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

Financial aid to students desiring education beyond the high school plays a vital part in the conception of any new philosophy of postsecondary education. With emphasis on making postsecondary education of some kind available to everyone who wants it, the question of financing that education places more responsibility upon the states, the federal government and institutions themselves. Financing has become so important it has raised one of the questions most basic to the concept of public higher education — how much of the cost of a student's education is he responsible for himself, and how much more will he be charged in the future for an education subsidized by tax money, state or federal?

"STATE AND FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY"

by Joseph D. Boyd, Executive Director
Illinois State Scholarship Commission

Student financial aid for meeting the costs of postsecondary education is big business! Yet as early as fifteen years ago, except for more expensive colleges with scholarship budgets, there was little discussion or involvement with funds or programs for needy students on college campuses or in legislative halls and executive offices at any level of government.

The scene has changed dramatically. Student gift aid programs (not counting veterans' and Social Security benefits) at the federal level amount to about $750 million annually, and the student aid budgets of 29 states having comprehensive programs have reached a level of about $370 million. If the new Basic Grant Program of the federal government is fully funded in the years ahead the taxpayers, through their elected representatives, will be investing a total of $1.5 billion in nonrepayable monetary awards for removing financial barriers to college attendance.

What are these investments to accomplish? The national goal of equal educational opportunity and the preservation of a strong diversified system of postsecondary education (both public and private colleges) are the basic motivating forces. To give students in this country both access and choice is the stated goal. To provide for manpower needs, to better the long-term economic growth of the individual and society, and to lessen the gap between the "haves" and "have nots" in our society are additional stated goals.

The uncertainties of the moment remain as to whose role it is to provide what level and type of student aid to accomplish these purposes. A federal Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education will soon release its findings and recommendations to help answer the major issues.

1. Who should pay for higher education—the individual or society?
2. How do federal, state, and institutional aid programs best work in partnership?
3. Who is the better delivery agent of programs of aid to the student—an agency of government or an institutional aid officer?
4. What is the proper mix of gift aid, loan and work in meeting costs?
5. Is it better to aid institutions and keep tuitions at lower levels or aid students with need and let higher tuitions be paid by those able to afford them?

What is happening today, by design or accident, in student financial aid? Need, not ability, is the predominant criterion of determining who should get dollars. The federal government continues to emphasize access and institutionally based administration of federal funds for needy students. States give equal or higher priority to choice of institution in relationship to access and administer their programs and dollars through one centralized state agency. Federal guidelines have generally been flexible, and state procedures tend to be precise and standard.

The new federal Basic Grant is potentially the most significant building block for future partnership development. If the federal government desires to provide "access" and the states build upon this purpose with programs allowing

"choice," a better realization of two basic goals can soon become a reality in more states than we have had in the past.

An analysis of the record shows that a student's state of residence can deeply influence his or her choice of college. The rich states of New York, Pennsylvania and Illinois have through annual student aid budgets totalling almost $200.0 million permitted not only access and choice, but preserved the vitality of their nonpublic colleges in a period of great economic uncertainty. Other states can report almost similar results.

Pending in Washington is an authorized, but as yet unfunded, program which, in my opinion, is much desired and needed. The SSIG (State Scholarship Incentive Grant Program), a form of specialized revenue sharing, would match certain state appropriations of needy student gift aid with federal dollars to be administered by the state for the same purpose. The program could motivate all states, not just the 29 states with existing comprehensive programs, to play their role alongside the federal programs in providing access and choice by removing financial barriers.

What is needed if you believe that postsecondary education is to be available for all who can profit and grow from additional education, regardless of the financial circumstances of their parents? I would encourage strong and well informed support for the adequate funding and success of both the Basic Grant and State Scholarship Incentive Grant Programs. The Education Commission of the States is also solidly back of this approach.

Beyond the gift aid investments, we must also unite our efforts in a federal-state partnership in providing educational loans. The needy student should invest in his future by his own earnings and reasonable borrowing. Additional and immediate thought must be given to the improvement of loan programs. We have chaos in educational loan programs today because of excessive patchwork and uncertainty as to what purposes loans are to achieve.

Whereas under an entitlement concept many needy students are assured of scholarships and grants, the availability of a needed and desired loan is often subject to variables of uncertainty based upon the varied responses of commercial lenders or institutional aid officers with limited funds.

I foresee, in the next several years, a greater role of the states in providing loans from funds they administer and control. Agreements with the federal government can assist in guaranteeing the principal in case of default, and certain subsidized interest costs can also be a federal responsibility.

The multiplicity of student aid programs and applications is bringing a crisis in overlap and communication of opportunity. I believe that in the near future it is advisable that a state agency should have the authority, through one annual application, to determine what federal and state monetary awards and loan benefits are available to a state resident desiring education beyond high school. Furthermore, the state can develop reciprocity agreements with other states to further expand choice and remove the artificial barriers of a state line to one who is a U.S. citizen as well as a resident of a given state.

The greatness in this country is how we use and develop our human capital. What we do or do not do with our young adults in the crucial years of 18 to 25 can dramatically influence what kind of society and personal future they have in the years ahead.

Each generation of stewards of tax dollars makes decisions having significant impact on education beyond high school. As the land grant college act and the GI Bill had their impacts in earlier years, so can the big decisions on a partnership of federal, state and institutional student aid dollars significantly have impact on the 1970s and 1980s. Master planners and decision makers at both the federal and state level are now making fewer decisions regarding brick and mortar as enrollments become stable or drop and should be turning their attention to how best to accomplish other goals with the wise use of taxpayers' dollars in the public issue of postsecondary education.

"NEEDS AND RESOURCES IN THE SOUTH"

by Jerry S. Davis, Research Associate
SREB

Those of you who have looked into matters of student financial aid must have an idea that providing aid to students for postsecondary education is a complex matter which concerns many educational, economic, social and political issues. All of you know from experience that decisions concerning complex issues cannot be made rationally without data or other kinds of information. The SREB is involved in a series of inquiries regarding student financial aid and paying for the costs of education beyond high school. It is hoped that information obtained by and reported from these inquiries will help policy-makers make better decisions about student financial aid and the pricing structure of postsecondary education.

My task is to report on the preliminary findings of a study of financial aid needs and resources for undergraduate education in the region. Since our time is limited and a more comprehensive report and analysis for each SREB state is planned for this Fall, I will only describe briefly what we have found and assist you in the interpretation of the tables we are providing. But first, I want to offer some comments to help you understand what we mean by financial aid needs or problems.

There are many kinds of financial aid needs, according to whose objectives are involved. States need to use financial aid to foster and facilitate the enrollment of students whose career plans will meet some manpower objective. Institutions need to use financial aid to foster and facilitate the enrollment of students of a particular kind and/or in sufficient numbers to utilize space and instructional resources efficiently and effectively. Students need to use financial aid to enroll in institutions or programs which might otherwise be beyond their financial means. Private agencies or special interest groups need to use financial aid to foster and facilitate enrollment of students who will enter some profession or provide some service to their membership or clientele. The financial aid problem is made all the more complex by the fact that all of these parties are involved in the awarding of aid to many different kinds of students with many different kinds of needs with many different kinds of objectives in mind. What Dr. Boyd has described as a partnership between the state and federal governments, institutions, private agencies, and students and families to provide aid is a partnership which is frequently bound only by an implicit contract or agreement to cooperate with each other. The "contract" needs to be made explicit through programs like the State Incentive Grant Program and other programs which involve state governments and institutions.

You will note that I mentioned students and families as a "source" of financial aid. They are in the sense that they make personal and economic sacrifices which have grave social and educational consequences in order to pay the costs of education. Our study focuses attention on *student* financial aid needs rather than state, institutional or some other agency's needs. In other words, we are interested in finding out how much aid is needed to enable all qualified students who wish to continue their education beyond high school to do so at an equitable and reasonable expenditure of their own and their families' resources, with assistance from all agencies concerned with financial aid. It will be possible to determine, from our data, how state, institutional and other agency needs might be met with financial aid but our primary focus is the student.

We are able to assess the student financial need problem through a method called *aggregate need analysis*. This method has been used and proven valid in statewide studies in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia as well as states outside the region.

I want to demonstrate our methodology to you because it will help to illustrate one of the primary reasons we have a financial need problem in the region. The financial aid problem is, to a great extent, a function of the types and amounts of aid; who controls the distribution of the aid; and the availability of aid to students of varying financial capabilities at different types of institutions.

In Table I we have our basic data for a state's four-year public colleges: (1) number of full-time students, 37,430; percentage of males and females; student self-help contributions, $545 and $445; a Weighted Average Student Budget for all students, whether commuter or resident, $2056. We also have a family income distribution for these students. Twenty-two percent of them come from families of less than $6000 annual income, 15 percent come from families with incomes of from $6000 to $8999, and so on.

Let's look at the $6000 to $8999 interval. Families with incomes in this range and no unusual financial circumstances with 2.5 dependent children (a low average for the region) are expected *on the average* to contribute $285 a year to a dependent child's education. Each student is expected to contribute an average of $502 from summer and term-time earnings toward his educational costs. The sum of $502 and $285, $787, represents available student and family resources. It costs $2056 per year to attend the colleges. The difference between $2056 and $787 is $1269, or the student's financial need. If there are 5615 of these students, their aggregate financial need is $7,125,435. There is, in this example, $6,507,463 in aid available to meet these students' needs. Therefore, the aggregated *unmet financial need* is $617,972.

Similarly, for line three, the $9000 to $11,999 interval, we estimate an aggregate financial need of $4,782,915 and an unmet financial need of $1,428,166. You will note that there is no aggregate financial need or unmet financial need for the $12,000 or more interval. This is because *average* student and parental resources exceed the costs by $84. You will also note that there is $3,134,774 in aid available to these students. The reason such aid is available is because most of the financial aid in post-secondary institutions is not administered solely on the basis of financial need. In other words, aid which can be used to meet educational costs is awarded because a student has some special talent, he is in a special academic or prevocational program, he is an alumni dependent, or some other reason independent of his financial circumstances. In short, someone is paying him to go to college.

It should be obvious that varying costs, family incomes and contributions, and expected student contributions will have an impact on the financial need for any particular interval. It should also be obvious that, if aid available to the students in the $12,000 or more interval was distributed to students in the less than $6000 interval, the aggregate unmet financial need for this group of colleges would be reduced from $5,853,825 to $1,719,051.

Let me note that we are not assuming that there are no students with need in the $12,000 or more income intervals. There are such students of unusual family financial circumstances. What we are assuming is that, *on the average*, students from families of $12,000 or more generally have the resources to meet the average education costs at most types of institutions.

In identifying available financial aid, we looked at all sources of financial aid, regardless of type or whether it was from institutions, private sources, or state and federal governments. We have included vocational rehabilitation funds and Social Security education benefits as financial aid, even though they may not be based on financial need. In looking at institutional aid, we included as available aid monies which are awarded as graduate fellowships, athletic grants in aid, band scholarships, etc. We wanted to determine the maximum amount of institutional aid which might be available to meet undergraduate needs if all that is currently used for aid was diverted to this purpose.

Let's look at the major findings of our study as reported in Table II. In 1971-72, there was $1,084,130,000 dollars in financial need in the SREB region. There was approximately $823 million available to meet that need. The unmet need or the financial aid problem for the region exceeded $360 million for the students enrolled as full-time undergraduates in the region. To look at the problem another way, the average unmet need for each needy student was $387 per year. Or, for every $1.00 of need experienced by needy students, there was only $.76 available in financial aid from every source.

In terms of institutions, the biggest financial and unmet need is at the four-year public institutions. They also enroll the most students. Proportionately, however, the biggest problem is at the four-year nonpublic colleges. While these colleges enroll only 20 percent of the students, they have 30 percent of the financial need and almost 40 percent of the unmet financial need.

By income interval, the largest problems exist for students from families of less than $6000 income and for the independent student. The independent student's financial aid needs represent a problem which has emerged in recent years with more traditionally college-age students becoming financially independent of their parents and with the increase in attendance of nontraditional students, i.e., housewives, former college dropouts who want to be retrained for new vocations, etc. While their financial aid needs are proportionately smaller than their number, their unmet needs are greater because institutions and agencies have not responded to them with programs of financial assistance.

You are probably wondering how much money states are now spending in student

financial aid. It is almost impossible to give a precise answer because of the record keeping procedures of many state agencies, the way public institutions or federally insured loan programs operate. Our best estimate is that approximately 5 percent of the available aid is from state allocations made directly to students by state agencies *other than institutions*. About 30 percent of the aid comes through institutions. About 25 percent comes to students from the federal CWSP, NDSL, SEOG, LEAP, and Health Professions programs. Another 20 percent is available through Social Security Educational Benefits. The remaining 20 percent is from private sources, usually banks, credit agencies, and other agencies participating in one or more insured loan programs.

Excluding Social Security Benefits and other educational benefits from the total, approximately 33 percent of the available aid is in the form of grants, 42 percent in the form of loans, and 25 percent in the form of work.

While students have access to more financial resources now than ever before, this is still a tremendous unmet financial aid problem for them. The financial need will not go away without your and other public policy makers' actions. The new BEOG Program, as much as it should be praised, will not solve the students' problems at its current or projected levels of funding. States must act, in cooperation with other private and governmental agencies if the need is to be met.

TABLE I

AGGREGATE NEED ANALYSIS, COMPUTATIONAL EXAMPLE

Type of Institution - 4-Year Public Colleges - Dependents Only

Number of Full-Time Students - 37,430
Percentage of Males: 57 - Females: 43
Student Self-Help Males $545 - Females $445
Weighted Average Student Budget $2,056

Income Interval	(1) % Students	(2) Number Students	(3) Average Family Contribution	(4) Student Self-Help	(5) Financial Need	(6) Total Financial Need	(7) Available Financial Aid	(8) Unmet Financial Need
Less than $6,000	22	8,235	-0-	$502	$1,544	$12,797,190	$8,989,503	$3,807,687
$6,900 to $8,999	15	5,617	$285	502	1,269	7,125,435	6,507,463	617,972
$9,000 to $11,999	20	7,485	915	502	639	4,782,915	3,354,749	1,428,166
$12,000 or more	43	16,095	2140	502	-0-	-0-	3,134,774	-0-
						$24,705,540	$24,636,973	$5,853,825

Column 5 = Weighted Average Student Budget minus the sum of columns 3 and 4.
Column 6 = Financial Need (column 5) x Number of Students (column 2).
Column 8 = Total Financial Need (column 6) minus Available Financial Aid (column 7).

TABLE II

REGION

Institutional Type	% Enrollment	Financial Need (millions)	Total Available Aid (millions)	Generally Available Aid (millions)	Unmet Need (millions)	Unmet Need Per Needy Student
4-Year Public	55.8	$534.52	$432.73	$174.04	$153.47	$308
4-Year Non-Public	19.9	348.81	230.42	138.74	140.69	749
2-Year Public	17.5	140.06	121.93	29.41	36.05	205
2-Year Non-Public	2.2	28.14	18.85	10.56	11.35	586
Public Vo-tech	4.6	37.60	19.20	4.60	18.97	389
Totals	100.0	$1,089.13	$823.13	$357.35	$360.53	$387

Family Income Interval	% Enrollment	Financial Need (millions)	Total Available Aid (millions)	Generally Available Aid (millions)	Unmet Need (millions)	Unmet Need Per Needy Student
Below $6,000	21.2	$445.68	$378.23	$164.03	$ 91.18	$300
$6,000 - $8,999	14.9	306.56	250.81	111.64	60.93	286
$9,000 - $11,999	15.3	139.70	92.28	50.48	58.06	267
Above $12,000	28.3	7.90	59.77	8.52	2.91	65
Independent	20.3	189.39	42.04	22.68	147.45	1,120
Totals	100.0	$1,089.13	$823.13	$357.35	$360.53	$387

COMMENT

SENATOR LEONARD DUNAVANT, TENNESSEE

Since you are in my city and in the city where I represent part of the voters and the residents, I want to say that I am delighted to have you here.

I want to talk just a few moments about what was said by the two gentlemen who spoke before and then I'm going to tell you a little about our history and where we are in Tennessee.

The rising cost of tuition is a real problem in Tennessee as it is in your states, I am sure. This is true in both the private and the public sector. We are having difficulty particularly amongst our private institutions in their staying alive and certainly we have a concern about this.

In Tennessee our "aid" goes according to the need rather than to the ability of the student as far as state funds are concerned. Federal funds, as you mentioned, are a big help. Some of our institutions more aggressively go out for federal grants and federal assistance than others but it is a real, vital part of the operating budgets of the Southern institutions across our state.

There is a growing concern amongst those in the General Assembly in Tennessee about the rising cost of higher education and they are looking at the increased earning ability that higher education provides to an individual. Some strong effort may be made in the days and years ahead to call for some kind of payback system from the beneficiaries of the education expenditures that were provided through tax money from the state. And we in Tennessee are embarking on our second year in a state aid system. Prior to that time, all we had was a line item appropriation to the institutions of the state and they administered the funds themselves. We also have a loan system in the state as you have in yours, I'm sure—a payback system.

The philosophy behind embarking on a course of applied funds to students in both private and public institutions was twofold. We felt that the student was able to get something at the smaller private schools that may not have been obtainable and may not be obtainable at the large state-supported institutions. That was one reason. The other reason is we feel that the smaller institution has a unique contribution to make to society, that it has made a unique contribution to society across the years and that it will continue to do so. These, I think, were the reasons which compelled us to embark on this course.

We had the usual arguments about separation of church and state but there were some powerful arguments opposing this and it was an easy piece of legislation. The local churches that supported many of these institutions exerted considerable pressure because they felt they wanted their schools to survive and we certainly wanted them to survive.

We have enrolled in our state about 100,000 in the public institutions and about 35,000 in the private institutions. A little over half of those in private institutions are state students and we have a maximum grant for students of $1,000. Last year, our first completed year, we had a very small appropriation—particularly small when you look at what Illinois is doing. We had $1,200,000 to start out. This went out to between 1,900 and 2,000 students. About 42 percent of the students who received aid were from private schools, 58 percent from the public supported schools. Sixty five percent of the dollars went to this 42 percent of the students who received aid at private institutions. We have appropriated this fiscal year $2,250,000. We expect assistance to go somewhere between 3,500 and 4,000 students. We don't know how far we're going down this road and how fast we're going. We have to look, of course, at what we want to do in higher education per se.

One other argument that was advanced substantially when we were debating the issue on the floors of the two houses was that we had been appropriating large sums in the millions of dollars every year for new buildings for the state supported institutions. The private schools had had a small fall off in enrollment and they had space available. Of course, we find out now that we probably won't need any more buildings per se in the state supported institutions so it was timely for a bill to come before the general assembly that did launch a program of support to students who wished to receive higher education.

SENATOR RUSSELL KIRBY, NORTH CAROLINA

I don't know how well acquainted most of you are with the Southern Regional Education Board. I think it's one of the very finest things that's ever been fostered by the southern states and I just wish that some of the lessons that have been learned here could be filtered down to a lower level of state government.

Some of the recent educational highlights in North Carolina are these: Certainly one of the "traumatic experiences" was the restructuring of higher education in our state. If you don't know it, I can tell you that sacred cows don't die easily, and some of the very vulnerable institutions that we have in North Carolina made a fight to preserve what they had just as they had it. Obviously, higher education in North Carolina couldn't have continued as it was in the years past. It got to the point that the general assembly was the place where every trustee and every friend of every institution was found from the time the doors opened until the end of the session and the one word that was uppermost in everybody's mind was "money." How much can we get for our institution? Obviously we could not proceed along those lines. We had to make changes and finally—I will remind you that it took a special session of the general assembly in North Carolina, it couldn't be done in the regular session—it was done. We did get North Carolina restructured. Now we have a governing board in North Carolina, not a coordinating board.

When we first started talking about the restructuring we started out with what we considered to be a very strong coordinating board. But, before it was all over with, we had a real governing board and we concluded that was the only answer for a situation as topsy-turvey and in as bad shape as our particular setup had gotten to be. In our state we had done like some other states and had made a few instant universities. We reached a point when things had to be straightened out as best they could be.

After you go through these fights—and they are great—you find out that you see the same people after the fight's over and they tell you about what a fine job you've done in restructuring and what a great system this is and how many states have come to look at it and what tremendous service has been performed for the state.

One of the other highlights of education in North Carolina—and this is something that we are proud of in our state—we did get into the insured loan program before the Federal government got into it. I am sure that the Virginia senator got into it before the government, also. We got into it a year or two before the Federal Government started its programs but it just happened that ours was just a skeleton at the time the Federal program came along and the framework we had set up worked beautifully in the new setup. At that time we had what I considered an unfriendly governor and he took our bill and breathed life into it and we really got, excuse this new term, a viable loan program going in our state years before I thought we would. Our first appropriation was $50,000. Two years ago we passed a bill in our state which authorized the sale of $50,000,000 in state bonds for loans in North Carolina. Not all of them have been sold yet, in fact only about one third of them have been sold, but we have the machinery set up for this.

Another highlight of higher education in our state is passage of a bill during the last session of the general assembly whereby students attending private institutions would get $200 paid to the student, not to the institution. We had pretty much the same experience as everybody else in the United States had; we found the state institutions originally were educating less than half the students but as time went by they educated more of the students and the private sector dwindled. We actually had empty buildings in North Carolina, as the Senator from Tennessee mentioned for his state.

We felt we should use these fine private facilities. It didn't make sense to us to be building tremendous buildings on the publically owned campuses while just across the street you might have private buildings that were half empty.

North Carolina has historically and currently done what I consider to be a very important job of funding higher education. Our new governing setup has helped in this in that only one person or one group speaks for the needs of North Carolina and it's not the babble of voices we've had before. We're very much ahead of some of you, I'm sure, concerning the recommendation that tuition be raised and that more and more of the cost of education be paid by the student. North Carolina got a jump on everybody; we raised tuition two years ago. But more than anything else, it penalized, I thought, out-of-state students because it made a tremendous difference between costs for a resident and nonresident student. Even so, we didn't

completely cover the cost to the state but a great deal of the gap was closed between the two points. We figured in North Carolina that there is some $1,400 at least given to every student who attends one of our universities so the taxpayer does have a considerable stake in this field.

NEW FORMS OF REGIONAL COOPERATION

Regional cooperation, for 25 years a philosophy that has supported and extended the South's educational abilities, is still widely received as a necessity to future educational development in the region. Under direction of a new SREB Commission on Regional Cooperation, chaired by President Harry M. Philpott of Auburn University, an extensive program of shared facilities, shared classroom spaces, interstate exchange of students, an inter-institutional cooperation in development of academic disciplines has been proposed and endorsed by many educators and governmental leaders in Southern states. These states are also interested in cooperating to develop and distribute more compatible data about higher education to assist states and institutions in the job of future planning.

"PROPOSALS FOR NEW FORMS OF REGIONAL COOPERATION"

by Prince B. Woodard
Chancellor, West Virginia Board of Regents
Member, SREB Commission on Regional Cooperation

Each state faces financial stringencies which will not allow a continuation of the high rate of new programs and new facilities in our colleges and universities, which has prevailed during the past two decades.

This situation is causing serious concern. There is fear that, with the stabilizing of support for higher education, colleges and universities will suffer a reduction in equality. It will be, some feel, impossible to maintain the high standards which have been obtained in our classrooms and laboratories.

Certainly none of us wants to see the work of recent years undone. The quality of scientific research in our universities is regarded as the highest in the world. It has provided the force for major breakthrough in combating disease and conquering space. Research and trained personnel are now needed more than ever to help find solutions to our urban problems and ways to protect our environment.

The major issue is: Can we keep pace with the higher education achievements of the past two decades considering the present tight financial situation?

I maintain that we can. I believe the answer lies in better planning and more efficient use of resources at the institutional, state and national levels.

Many things can be done in our region if the SREB states make a collective effort. Last year the Southern Regional Education Board committed itself to giving unprecedented attention to this objective by endorsing a practical but far-reaching proposal to maximize the use of existing resources through regional cooperation. Specifically, the proposal called for:

- † Exploring possible arrangements for interstate access to colleges and universities within commuting distance of residents in adjoining states.
- † Using cooperatively special and expensive educational facilities.
- † Expanding the student contract program.
- † Convening disciplinary leaders for cooperative planning of future program activities.
- † Developing a program of information and evaluation to help institutional and governmental leaders assess educational needs.
- † And, developing an academic common market to obtain greater use of uncommon programs and to increase educational opportunities.

Underlying the Board's proposal was recognition of the fact that it is both *impractical* and *expensive* for states to attempt complete self-sufficiency in higher education. Even if this were

not a time for cutting expenses, it would be nearly impossible for any single state to provide the full array of programs required to meet the diverse higher education needs of its citizenry. However, by sharing educational programs and facilities states can simultaneously broaden opportunities and conserve resources.

Last year a Commission on Regional Cooperation was established by the SREB to give direction in planning and implementing the Board's proposal. The Commission is a broad-based group, representing state government and all of postsecondary education. Five of the eighteen members are state legislators: Harold Breazeale, State Representative, South Carolina; Fritz Eagan, State Senator, Louisiana; B.G. Perry, President of the Senate, Mississippi; Terell Sessums, State Representative, Florida; and Ray Smith, State Representative, Arkansas.

The Commission spent its first year laying the groundwork for new forms of regional cooperation. Materials and documents were prepared, basic information collected, and a number of groups were convened to consider the development of new regional cooperative activities.

To be specific, a catalog of uncommon facilities in Southern universities is ready for use. Arrangements have been worked out with participating institutions to give students and faculty members from anywhere within the region access to these facilities.

For example, the Geochronology Laboratory at the University of Georgia—one of only three such laboratories in the region—may now be used by non-university personnel whose research requires its special services. Texas A&M University has a 180' research vessel with a 6,000 mile range. University officials have agreed to accommodate up to three additional scientists per cruise from other institutions. The Experimental Stress Analysis Laboratory at Auburn University, one of the very few in the entire nation, has been opened to faculty members, graduate students, and advanced undergraduates from other institutions within the region to use without charge.

Through joint use of such existing facilities scholars will be able to conduct valuable studies and, simultaneously, spare their own institutions the expense of unnecessary duplication.

Leaders from disciplinary groups were convened—and will continue to be convened—to work on mutual problems and to discuss ways of improving their disciplines through cooperative arrangements.

A state exchange of information on proposals for new doctoral programs and termination of existing programs is now in operation. The results from the first call for such information show that 52 doctoral programs were recently created in the SREB region. Whether or not they were all necessary is difficult to say. The Commission expects the exchange eventually to serve as a brake upon establishment of new doctoral programs in fields which could be readily served by existing programs in the region.

A major development of the Commission is a proposal for putting an *academic common market* into operation throughout the fourteen-state region. A specific document whereby the academic common market may be implemented has been drafted and extensively reviewed by individuals throughout the region. In brief, the proposed common market is an interstate agreement for sharing certain academic programs through an exchange of students across state lines. Students will have access to programs not offered in their state at in-state rates.

Together, the reports, materials and proposals of the Commission are a significant beginning for conserving our resources. The question is, will we take advantage of it?

Dr. Harry Philpott, President of Auburn, reported on the work of the Commission at the recent Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Education Board. He said that, "the activities (of the Commission during its first year) have sufficiently paved the way for new cooperative ventures and the time is now at hand for concrete action." Whether or not these new forms of regional cooperation planned by the Commission are implemented will depend on the leaders in our states, our legislative bodies and our institutions of higher education. Clearly the opportunities are available.

Will maximum use be made of the catalog of uncommon facilities? Potential users will need to be encouraged for they are not accustomed to viewing facilities elsewhere as a satisfactory alternative to having their own. It may be necessary for states to provide travel expenses for scholars using facilities not on their own campus. This approach will certainly cost less than duplicating expensive facilities. SREB is currently seeking private support to initiate such a program.

What about the numerous reports and studies that have been prepared to coordinate developments in the region: Will they be used? These reports were designed to keep institutional and state planners aware of conditions and develop-

ments in the rest of the region. If they are not used, we will continue to find programs being developed simultaneously in different parts of the region, resulting in more programs than we need.

And what about the proposed academic common market? Will states and institutions take the necessary action to make it operative in the region?

I wish to devote the remainder of my time to the common market because it is a proposal which, unlike the other cooperative ventures, will require some form of formal approval in each state. It is ready for *adoption now*. In some states, approval will come from the institutions themselves or the state coordinating board; in others, it may need to come from the governor or the legislative body.

First, let me stress that the common market is a plan which provides an opportunity to save taxpayers of the participating states sizable sums of money.

There is not a single state represented here that does not have some uncommon higher educational programs in its colleges and universities capable of accommodating additional students. It would be economical for all to share and this is what the common market proposes to do.

As educational needs in a particular state change, demands for new programs to meet these needs develop. Often these identical programs are already in existence in nearby states and frequently can accommodate more students. But high out-of-state tuition discourages movement of students across state lines and eventually the state is forced to establish its own programs. The result—additional new programs duplicating those in nearby states which are operating below their optimum enrollment level.

The common market offers an alternative. By waiving out-of-state tuition for these specific programs, students will have easy access to them. As a result, much of the need for duplicating programs will be eliminated. Cost per student will be lowered through better use of existing programs. Additional educational opportunities will be created without additional programs. And, with barriers to out-of-state programs eliminated, the case for retaining many unproductive and high cost programs will be weakened, thus opening the possibility of phasing them out.

Basic to the common market proposal is the waiver of out-of-state tuition for students enrolling in programs which have been placed in the market by the respective states and institutions. Since many of our states have recently raised out-of-state tuition in an effort to increase tuition revenues, the question which might be asked is: Will not the waiving of out-of-state tuition for these programs substantially reduce the funds available for higher education?

Not necessarily. Even if it did, the lost funds would be more than compensated for by the savings of expenditures which would be required to initiate new academic programs.

Waiving out-of-state tuition on a *select* basis, that is, for those programs capable of accommodating more students, could be financially beneficial since it would tend to encourage more students to enroll.

Offering services at a reduced rate to maximize returns from committed resources is an accepted principle of good management in many businesses. The airlines industry has for years offered tickets on a standby basis at a reduced rate to fill flights.

For example, let us say we have committed resources in the form of faculty salaries, equipment, and capital outlay for a program capable of accommodating 80 students and that the program is currently operating at one-half its capacity. If the students are evenly split between in-state and out-of-state the tuition revenue would be approximately $30,000. If, on the other hand, out-of-state tuition were waived for students from other participating states to raise the enrollment to full capacity the tuition revenues would be approximately $45,000, an increase of 50 percent. These figures are based on the assumption that in-state tuition is $500 and out-of-state tuition is $1,000 and that 10 students would be nonresidents from outside the region. These students, of course, would continue to pay out-of-state tuition under the common market. *These figures are consistent with existing conditions in many of our academic programs.*

In brief, many programs would be better off financially as well as educationally operating at full level but charging only in-state rates for regional students than they would be by operating half filled with regional students paying out-of-state tuition.

As we all know, there is some doubt as to the legality of out-of-state tuition. The recent Supreme Court decision seems to indicate that, in general, we may continue to charge out-of-state tuition but that we cannot require it to be paid by a student if, after a certain period of time, he shows reasonable evidence of being a state resident.

It is also possible that eventually any differential will be considered illegal. If this happens,

there will still be a need to cooperate on our academic offerings. In fact, the need may be even greater. Eliminating out-of-state tuition, by itself, will not assure easy access for residents of one state into programs in other states. Preference in selecting students could still be given the residents of the state. Without the additional revenue obtained from the high out-of-state tuition, accepting nonresidents may be discouraged and states may be tempted to set a strict quota on the number to be accepted.

A common market arrangement would mean that, even without a tuition differential, each state would agree to offer certain programs as a service to the region; that is, they would readily accept students from other states applying for the specified programs.

At its Annual Meeting the Southern Regional Education Board urged states and institutions to approve the common market as quickly as possible. September 30 has been set as a target date for states and institutions to decide whether or not they wish to participate during the first year of operation.

The benefits to be derived from the common market and the other new cooperative arrangements are, for the most part, quite evident. We will only penalize ourselves if we fail to take advantage of them. With your support these proposals can be implemented.

This is a time of growing demands on state resources. In such a time we must be especially interested in using what we have more effectively. The Commission on Regional Cooperation views an increase in cooperative interstate undertakings as a large part of the answer.

I close by encouraging you to ask questions relating to the work of the Commission and to offer any suggestions you have for furthering cooperative efforts.

"THE FUTURE OF STATE GOVERNMENT - HIGHER EDUCATION RELATIONSHIPS"

by Clark Kerr, Chairman
Carnegie Commission on Higher Education

"The United States is one of the major nations where the basic responsibility for higher education lies with the states rather than with the national government and it is a commentary on the equality of the discharge of this responsibility by the states that the United States has the best overall system of higher education in the world. It is marked by high quality as well as by high quantity, by diversity and by comparatively dynamic adjustment to changing conditions." The future relationships between the state houses and higher education will be effected by a number of changes, including an increase in support by the federal government, a reevaluation of tuition charges, a slowing in the growth of higher education enrollments and changing needs in kinds of postsecondary institutions.

The Carnegie Commission will complete this fall 6 years of study of higher education in the United States. We have been impressed by many things:

† By the vast increase in federal support, now amounting to almost one-half of all public funds;

† By the great satisfaction, contrary to some public opinion, of students with their colleges—at the level of 85 percent;

† By the new dissensus within faculties about the role of institutions of higher education in political activities. About two-thirds or three-fourths of faculty members stand by the old understandings; but apparently one-third or one-fourth take a more aggressive (and we think unwise) position;

† By the lack of any discernible increase in the measurable productivity of higher education;

† By the maintenance of the academic quality of students even as their numbers have increased greatly; and by much else that we have found.

But nothing has impressed us more than the performance of the 50 states in their care for higher education. Between approximately 1960 and 1970:

† Total enrollments, most of them in public institutions, went up 126 percent, or 8.5 percent a year, from 3,789,000 to 8,581,000. No one was turned away for lack of space.

† Educational and general expenditures on higher education, with the states as the most important single source of funds, rose by 207 percent, or 13.3 percent a year, from $4,540,000,000 to $13,920,000,000.

† Over 400 new campuses were created by the states (1957-1970), raising the total numbers from 671 to 1089, an increase of over 60 percent.

† The percentage of personal income spent by the states and localities on higher education doubled from about 0.4 percent to over 0.8 percent. This figure is particularly remarkable because overall there is no discernible impact of student unrest on state and local financial support. There was much public outcry and gubernatorial and legislative oratory against the campuses but, when it came to voting money, the long-term trend of increases for campus support was maintained. A few states, of course, did less well, but others offset them.

The Southern states, by and large, did better than these national averages. They particularly in-

creased the number of their public institutions by 90 percent (a virtual doubling) as against the national 62 percent.

More generally, the United States is one of the few major nations where the basic responsibility for higher education lies with the states rather than with the national government (the other nations are West Germany, Canada and Australia), and it is a commentary on the quality of the discharge of this responsibility by the states that the United States has the best overall system of higher education in the world. It is marked by high quality as well as by high quantity, by diversity, and by comparatively dynamic adjustment to changing conditions.

The performance of the states in this important area of human endeavor has been generally superb. This record of performance by the states, however, has been somewhat obscured in recent times as we have gone through a "national period" in the development of higher education. This period lasted from about 1945 to 1972 and included the GI Bill of Rights after World War II, the federal support of science after Sputnik, and the expansion of funds for equality of opportunity in the 1960s. Federal initiative was at a high point. Federal programs, however, while needing many improvements in major ways are now largely in place, and initiative is returning to the states.

What about the future? Some very major changes are coming, not as basic as the development of the land-grant universities by the states after the War Between the States or as provision of universal access to higher education after World War II, but very substantial nevertheless.

1. The long rise in the burden on state and local taxpayers for the support of higher education is coming to an end, at least temporarily. If we define "burden" as the percentage of personal income spent on higher education from tax funds, it has risen quite steadily (except for the period of World War II) at least since 1929-30, and probably before then, if we had the statistics to show it. It was less than one-fifth of one percent in 1929-30, and is now approaching one percent on a nationwide basis. We believe it will rise to about this figure of one percent by the end of this decade (a number of states are already above this level) because enrollments are still growing, the cost per student rises each year, and more funds are needed to support low-income students and to assist private colleges. But, assuming that federal support will take over one-half of all public expenditires and that tuitions will increase (a point I will return to), we do not expect it to rise above about one percent in the 1980s, although it may in the 1990s. The uphill climb of the burden is about to end, perhaps for the first time in a century.

2. Tuition policy is being reopened in state after state; and we believe it will be in all, or nearly all, states. Public tuition has been lagging behind private tuition. The ratio is now about one to four between public and private when historically it was more like one to two-and-one-half. Also, public tuition has not been rising as fast as per capita disposable income, which is a crude measure of increasing ability to pay. We have suggested that, over a ten-year period, public tuition, on the average, might rise from its current one-sixth of instructional and general expenses to about one-third, provided that grants for low-income students keep pace. This one-third charge to those students who can afford to pay would, we believe, constitute rough justice in the assessment of costs.

3. The states will need to create more places for students but at a lesser rate than recently expected. Standard predictions were that enrollments would increase by one-half during the 1970s. Our current projection, however, is one-third instead. The rise in the high school graduation rate has slackened, and the enrollment rate of male high school graduates entering college has actually gone down recently. We now estimate that enrollments in the 1980s may fall in the range of 5 to 10 percent; and that increases in the 1990s, reflecting lower birth rates, will be much less substantial than once thought. Thus the need for new construction will be substantially reduced.

4. Nevertheless, there will be two million more students on a full-time equivalent basis in 1980 than 1970; and many new campuses will be necessary, particularly community colleges and comprehensive four-year colleges in urban areas. Existing colleges could accommodate the additional two million students if they were of the right types and in the right locations, but they are not. Thus we still see a need for about 200 more community colleges across the nation and 100 more comprehensive colleges (for a total of 300) to bring relatively open-access colleges within commuting distance of 95 percent of all Americans. We see no general need for any more research universities, although there may be exceptional individual circumstances that warrant their creation. We recommend caution in the creation of new health science centers.

5. New patterns of coordination are essential. As 50 percent of high school graduates, and 40

percent of that age group, have come to enter college, attention is now shifting to the opportunities for the other 50 or 60 percent. It would be unwise, for many reasons, if a large proportion of the additional 50 percent were to enter college. Yet many of them desire and can benefit from "further education" in industry, private specialty schools, the military, and so forth. Thus, the proper unit for overall planning should be postsecondary education, including both higher and further education, as envisaged in the 1202 Commissions under the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. It is our belief, however, that while over-all coordination should be at the level of postsecondary education, segmental coordination should also be provided covering smaller sections of the totality because the institutions and problems involved vary so greatly.

6. The states face new problems of accreditation, or at least validation, of institutions of postsecondary education. As federal and state funds become available to students in institutions outside higher education, someone must certify these institutions both to protect the use of taxpayers' money and to prevent fraud against individual students. We suggest that public actions should not generally rely on private accreditation. We thus propose that there be two systems of accreditation, one private and based on academic considerations to guide acceptance of credits and transfers, and one public and based on considerations of wise expenditures of public funds and of consumer protection.

7. Colleges and universities have been losing their independence rapidly over the past decade, both at the hands of the federal and state governments. We believe this to be generally unwise. A certain degree of independence is very helpful to each college and university for the sake of its sense of integrity and its ease of operation without excessive controls. From a public point of view, funds will generally be better spent without line item control than with it. And the states subject themselves to potential dangers if they become too involved in the direct operation of colleges and universities, as has happened in France.

The first necessity is to have boards of trustees made up of independent citizens of outstanding capacity. The second is to have some guidelines setting forth what belongs to the state and what belongs to the institution. The Carnegie Commission has prepared such suggested guidelines.

8. Innovation in higher education comes slowly. It is also highly necessary at this stage in history. Our Commission suggested the creation of a National Foundation for Higher Education which was later enacted into law as the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. We proposed similar funds at the state level, and at least one state—California—now has such a proposal before its legislature. We have also suggested that each institution set aside 1 to 3 percent of its budget each year for new endeavors.

When the states do want to intervene in the process of specific changes, we believe that it should not come by way of directives or detailed control but, instead, by way of inquiry, of suggestion, of more money, of new institutions.

One new type of institution that may warrant consideration is the Learning Pavillion for use of persons of all ages and, perhaps, best attached to a college or a public library.

9. Private colleges do need public support, and 35 states now have some form of financial assistance to them and to their students. We believe that all 50 states should make such provision, as several Southern states are now doing. The graduate of the private college makes as much of a contribution to society as does one from a public college; and support of private colleges is less expensive than provision of similar facilities solely at public expense. Private colleges also provide much of the diversity in American higher education, and thus of the optional choices available to students.

10. Collective bargaining now covers 15 percent of the American professoriate. Our studies show that about one-half of all faculty members favor collective bargaining. The movement is particularly advanced in community colleges and, to a much lesser extent, in comprehensive colleges. We expect the movement to spread. This will create problems for the states. They have, in the past, negotiated salary increases privately with the administrators or other representatives of higher education. In more and more cases they will now need to bargain with unions instead. They will need mechanisms to handle these bargaining relationships. They will also need to decide to what extent they will bargain about non-money matters, for it is customary in collective bargaining to trade off money and non-money considerations. This could carry the states very far into the conduct of the affairs of higher education. They may not want to be that much involved. Collective bargaining could bring a major shift in the nature of

governance. The tendency is for bargaining to end up at the door of the people with the money. It gravitates to where the money is and that means to the state capital.

In conclusion, the states (1) have a most creditable record in watching out for the welfare of higher education, and (2) face a new series of problems that will continue to test their good judgment. No group of states has a better mechanism for discussing and facing these problems than do the states affiliated with the Southern Regional Education Board.

Governors' Statements

GOVERNOR JOHN C. WEST, SOUTH CAROLINA

Several years ago, during some early discussions about a possible regional compact in the South, I remember how often the suggestion came up that the proposed new organization should be modeled after SREB. This organization, time after time, was equated with successful regionalism. It had a proven reputation; it had a good track record; it had succeeded in such a way that its experience could serve as a guide for others to follow.

Those comments struck me as the ultimate in endorsements; or, as the old saying goes, imitation was the sincerest form of flattery. SREB has become synonomous with educational progress and educational achievement in the Southern states. As chairman of the Southern Regional Education Board this year, I am deeply honored, and I am deeply committed, to maintaining that record of excellence, and to advancing this organization positively and constructively into its second quarter century of service.

I can recall those difficult days following World War II—the days which spawned the concept and the establishment of the Southern Regional Education Board. They were days when higher education in the South, and—in fact—the entire economy of the South was in serious trouble. In looking back over the accomplishments of SREB, and in looking back over the great progress which has been made as a result of this Board, I sometimes wonder what would have happened if this organization had not come into being, and had not become a focal point of regional progress in the South. The fact is, of course, that necessity was truly the mother of invention in the case of SREB. The Southern states did not have the resources to respond to the great needs which were facing them at the time. The fact is that while we have made tremendous progress in the South, we still do not have the resources to meet present needs. The concept of regionalism, and the concept of collective responsibility are just as valid today as 25 years ago. The need for SREB, and the importance of its work, are just as clear and critical as they were in those pivotal post-war years when the South picked itself up off the floor and built for itself a better way of life.

Your conference here today reflects the continuing awareness of that role. You are here to discuss "The Changing Face of Higher Education," and from the point of view of the South, we can be thankful that it has been changing for the last 25 years. It has been changing for the better. While we have always been justifiably proud of the excellent individual institutions which have developed in our area, both public and private, the South until a very few years ago had not addressed itself to the concept of a total educational system beyond the high school level for all its citizens. Until only a few years ago, less than half the high school graduates were going on to college, and in my own home state of South Carolina, the figure was only about one in three.

SREB served two specific purposes in that regard. First of all, it got us to thinking about our resources in a regional sense. It lowered the state boundaries and jurisdictional lines which were separating us, and made possible for us to begin utilizing the resources of all the States. As a result, it became possible for a veterinary student in one state to attend school in another; it became possible for a dental student in one state to cross state lines into another at state expense; it became possible for medical students to pursue educational opportunities in other states if there were no openings at home. Today, regional agreements continue to be an important part of our entire higher education effort in the South. As many as 23 institutions in 14 states are actively participating in programs involving such divergent fields as nursing, optometry, forestry, occupational therapy, public health, medicine and many more. In fiscal 1972, the member states of the Southern Regional Education Board spent 2.4 million dollars on regional contractural arrangements, and believe me, it was a bargain. Had each state been forced to provide educational opportunity for each of the students in these fields, the cost would have been prohibitive. Had each student been limited in his opportunity only to those institutions in his own state, education would have been truly stiffled for thousands of bright and deserving Southern students.

The fact is, of course, that thanks to SREB, opportunities have been provided at a cost that the state could afford. A means was discovered to expend educational opportunity without spending ourselves beyond our means.

SREB has been a vehicle for other important undertakings in our region. It has been a means by which public and private funds have been invested in research and study of a special return for our region. The South has had its own particular problems over the years, most of them related to its relatively low income level, and its relatively low level of educational attainments. SREB has been sentitive to those special problems, and special needs, and it has come up with practical and workable solutions for its member states. Your program today and tomorrow reflects that special sensitivity, covering such emerging issues as community colleges, vocational systems, student aid, and later this afternoon, the relationship of the professions to higher education. In short, SREB has been more than a means by which we could work across state lines; it has been a focal point of activity by which we could direct our efforts to problems affecting each state in the region.

In a more general and philosophical sense, SREB has served an even higher purpose. It has converted the traditional Southern respect for quality higher education into a working plan of progress for the entire region. It has mobilized the same types of energies and the same demand for quality which created and sustained our great individual institutions, and made it a region-wide principle. It has become the very catalyst by which institutions and states continue to seek out the best ways of serving their people in post high school education.

Perhaps this, after all, is the greatest achievement of SREB. It has proven to the Southern states that quality can—and must—be a part of their overall educational plans, and it has provided a means by which we can pursue that quality. As we look to the next 25 years of SREB activity, and I firmly believe that the role of this organization will be a lasting and continuing one, I envision that a whole new set of problems and opportunities will develop. But I believe that the principles of regionalism and the principles of interstate cooperation, will remain as one of the best tools by which we can address those problems. Today the issue confronting our institutions is not survival, as it was 25 years ago. It is a question of growth, improvement, and expanded purposes for our institutions. As in no other period of our history the role of higher education institutions in the South—and throughout the nation—has undergone enormous change in the last quarter of a century. The ivory tower has come back down to earth, and the ivy-covered walls have been given a good scrubbing. The theory that higher education should be separated from the mainstream of a community's life has been set aside, and has been replaced by the realization that higher education should be a living, breathing part of the community itself. The college diploma, in many instances, has taken the place of the high school certificate as the minimum educational requirement for jobs. And the concept of education beyond the high school level has been broadening to include technical training, professional, occupational training, and many more programs designed to serve the specific needs of the individual students. Graduates of these institutions today represent a new corps of serious-minded, career-oriented students.

SREB has taught a lot of people some lessons. Regionalism has become a vital—and respected—tool of public service throughout our nation, and proven itself time and again through organizations such as Appalachia, Coastal Plains, Ozarks, and many others. States are learning how to gain the greatest effectiveness and efficiency for their limited dollars and personnel. SREB helped to pave that way, and to set an example which has been of value throughout the nation.

In short, I am sold on SREB and I am delighted to have this opportunity to make my feelings known. As governor of one of the member states, I can cite many, many examples of how this organization has benefitted South Carolina. So can our legislative and educational members who share my enthusiasm for this organization. But the story of SREB's success lies not in what it may have done for one or two member states. It lies in the manner in which it has uplifted the ideals and the opportunities for an entire region, and each has brought them within the grasp of all of us. Serving as chairman of SREB this year is one of the finest honors which I have ever received since becoming governor of my state three years ago. But more important, it has provided an opportunity of service for all of us during the coming year. I welcome that opportunity, and I ask each of you to join me in sharing the benefits of SREB and supporting its high purposes. We are, after all, talking about more than a single board or organization. We are talking about the quality of education in the South, and I can think of no more important issue, and no greater challenge, facing any of us today.

GOVERNOR WINFIELD DUNN, TENNESSEE

I am an SREB dentist. I received an undergraduate degree from the University of Mississippi, in my home state and, after considering law, I came to the conclusion that my calling was to the healing arts.

Examining the fine universities in Louisiana, looking at the opportunities in Georgia and Tennessee, I determined that the Tennessee quarter system, permitting me to have a full four years' academic experience in three years was for me.

I came to Tennessee by way of the Superintendent of Education's office in Meridian, Mississippi, where I made application for an SREB arrangement. In Tennessee I paid the normal tuition that Tennessee students paid, while my native state of Mississippi made up the difference in out-of-state tuition. Without that additional help—the difference between the in-state and out-of-state tuition—I am confident that I could not have made it.

I've never ceased to be grateful. And I want to express my deepest appreciation for all that preceded the opportunity I've had to be with you today.

There are many things I can talk to you about. Not with the expertise in education that many gathered here might offer, but certainly with a great deal of enthusiasm and with an insight into a new world that I've discovered, day by day, for the last two and a half years while serving as Governor of Tennessee.

I have come to respect as much as any one thing I can imagine the devotion and dedication characteristic of the people I've met in education in Tennessee. I won't limit that compliment to those in public education. In our state we are privileged to have many fine people in the private sector of education. But surely my experiences with those who represent public education have been genuine and rewarding and are outstanding indications to me of the dedication which exists in this field.

I've just recently been exposed to some new thinking by an author whose name I had not known before his book came my way. I'd like to take this opportunity to borrow some thoughts and ideas from this man and share them with you.

The book is by David F. Linowes and is entitled *Strategies for Survival—Using Business Knowhow to Make Our Social System Work*. It expresses some of my own basic feelings about our responsibility as human beings today, our responsibility as public servants who have offered themselves in service, and the responsibilities that exist because some of us have chosen education as a way of life. But more important, the responsibility all of us have assumed by being willing to wake up and face each day confident that we can make a contribution toward a better way of life.

I was fascinated by some of Dr. Linowes' philosophy. He is a management man and his book was published by the American Management Association. I thought some of his phraseology so fresh and good I couldn't pass up the chance of sharing it with you today because it blends in so well, I think, with what might be your final thoughts as you listen shortly to a very distinguished educator and then go your separate ways back to your homes.

Dr. Linowes uses the expression in his book "the desanctification of traditional concepts." I thought this fascinating and enjoyed reading it as it related in particular to education.

The author is saying to us—his judgment based on management concepts that he has studied and dealt with over many productive years of his life—simply this: the business of doing business as usual is going to bring a life expectancy in education and perhaps in other major areas of concern to zero years. And this certainly does relate rather closely to the phrase "desanctification of traditional concepts." Dr. Linowes says it's upon us in America today, and I have to agree.

Looking back through the years to the time when I first really became aware of this world and what it was all about from an adult point of view—that takes me back to World War II—I can see life has been one crisis after another. Living as I have a crisis-oriented existence, I have come to the conclusion that we've reached a stage as a nation and as a people when it's time for us to begin, if indeed some of us haven't already begun, to think not in terms of crisis management but rather in terms of the kind of efficiency and effectiveness that can come from long-range planning.

Another expression Dr. Linowes uses instead of bureaucracy is "hit-or-missocracy" and describes it as the method by which we in government as well as in private have operated on a crisis oriented plane to the detriment of vital resources expended through the years.

What other problems have we that we need to face with a more level-headed, systematic, carefully evaluated and thoroughly planned approach?

The challenges are there: pollution, the decaying central cities which are still so vital a problem in our country, the financial problems of schools or colleges, or the remaining poverty which exists in our country and which we have not been able to deal with effectively. Or the massive welfare problem which continues to plague us. Dr. Linowes has left me with the strong impression that there is a better way for those of us committed to the public good to deal with our problems and our challenges.

I recently heard a distinguished educator say, "This is the day of accountability; this is a time when we've got to look thoroughly at what we've managed to do up to this point and then assess the possibility and the opportunity to do better." I can't go beyond my own experiences in state government in commenting on this, but I think in terms of the advances made in my state. It is a state where we have less than three percent unemployment today, where people are earning more than ever before in their lives. A state where there seems to be a tremendously desirable balance among all the concerns that face us. The racial balance seems to be fairly acceptable as long as we keep in mind the need to continue to make progress in this area.

We have an excellent balance between agriculture and service and service industry and industrial activity. We have a fine balance between the urban and rural elements in our state. We are extremely proud of these things. And as we think in terms of accountability, we think in terms of what we have done, how we reached this point in our development, and the way we should go about dealing with our problems in the future.

Let's turn our thoughts now to education. If you would agree with me at least to some extent that the desanctification of traditional concepts is at hand, if it hasn't already taken place in the minds of many, then what we are talking about is education.

In Tennessee we're putting aside the traditional concept that a child's education begins when he's six years old and enters the first grade. We are now moving into a full-scale kindergarten program for every child in our state, knowing full well that traditional concepts of education are no longer satisfactory. We have trained personnel with the ability to reach into the five-year-old mind. They can make a tremendous impact on the child when the elasticity of the young mind is so responsive to special attention, training and background. So here is a place my state is putting aside the old ways of approaching problems and moving into new ones.

I'm proud to say our legislature in its most recent session gave its full commitment to a program for students in the seventh through twelfth grades. They will be given the opportunity to discover whether they have talents and abilities that would not necessarily lead them toward a formal education beyond the twelfth grade, but perhaps to a career education or perhaps to a vocational or a technical or a trade experience that would mean much to them in their lives. This is a commitment made by a state which doesn't have the money it might need to spend solving problems but, nonetheless, a commitment I believe will mean a great deal to us as the years go by. So we're not doing business as usual in Tennessee. And we're not doing business as usual because we know that the life expectancy of this kind of attitude toward our problems today is zero years.

What about higher education? That's the reason you're gathered here. What do we hear about what is happening?

For one thing, we hear about the three year degree. Some people suggest that it offers an opportunity to save the parents of students thousands of dollars. It offers students an opportunity to be educated more rapidly and perhaps offers our educational institutions the opportunity to be snatched from the brink of bankruptcy. The practicality of it is appealing to many and would certainly have to be included among those approaches which reflect the desanctification of traditional concepts.

Another issue, which is an old concept, arises from the high cost of curriculum and the concept that if a student is to learn he has to be led every step of the way. The new idea is that if a student is given more autonomy he can plot his own educational course as long as he has the right kind of guidance. This is certainly desanctification of traditional concepts. Whether it has any substance is perhaps yet to be determined.

I read recently about Hampshire College in Massachusetts which has made a move bound to be controversial. This institution has done away with tenure for its professors. Here you find a college no longer captive of nonproductive teachers, if there are such. You find a college that's been given release from the inflexible curriculum.

There's one significant difference, however, between the idea of doing away with tenure in the public sector and in the private sector. In the private sector the significant difference is that a

teacher who maintains a reasonable degree of capability and achievement is in an obvious condition to survive, when one who simply can't, won't. And I think that is extremely important.

Thus, we are in the process of change today in education as well as in so many other walks of life. As Governor, I get to see them all. I get to see the changes demanded by the people, and I get to feel the changes demanded by their elected representatives. I think we have all the machinery and equipment necessary to make practicable and reasonable changes, changes that are calculated and based on the kind of planning possible with the powerful tools of management at our disposal. We have the manpower, we have the brain-power, we have the will-power in our country, particularly in education, to meet the challenges of the new day.

We are strongly divided in our state over the question of whether we need a new medical school and a school of veterinary medicine. I'm sure that's been a lively topic of conversation among you here. But I hope that in our state we can use the tools available to us in order to discern practically, reasonably and logically what we need to do on a carefully calculated planned approach to provide more trained medical people, whether they be to attend to human or animal needs.

Yes, we do have the tools. We do have the power. These combined can lead us successfully and productively to more accomplishments. I think we'll have to continue to be very flexible as we think in terms of our own personal commitment and in terms of the overall picture.

In my state we're seeking to do more and better things in higher education. We want to give the very best opportunity possible to the young as well as to the more mature who seek and hunger after knowledge. We've created a new system of government in our state to deal with the regional universities. The fine system, under a Board of Regents, complements the Board of Trustees of our land grant institution, the University of Tennessee. And we're building a good system of vocational and technical schools and technical institutes. We're doing those things we feel will best commit us to the future for our citizens.

But there are the plaguing, nagging, and frequently irritating demands of other segments of government pulling at us. They are pulling at us in a very meaningful way, however. They are challenging education and are aware of what we're producing, the progress we're making, and the kind of assessment we're banking on to justify our continued steps in the future.

As you look at the problems, you can see they're no different in Missouri than they are in Tennessee, or no different in Oregon than they are in North Carolina. We all face the problem of recapturing humanity through a correctional program, the problems of vocational-technical training for the handicapped, the problems of taking care of the mentally retarded, the problem of giving hope to mothers and fathers who can't care for their own offspring who are so tragically abused by nature in some instances.

All of the problems, the drug problems, the morality problems that accompany the entire spectrum, challenge our dedication in a very real way. I think in terms of a broad range of promises of future prosperity for our country. The problems we have identified today and have clearly outlined need to be approached on a practical, sound management basis. They are problems which will absorb all of the funds the public is willing to provide so that government can do as best it can to meet human need. So we're not operating in a vacuum.

In education we're operating in an environment in which we are constantly pelted by other nagging needs and demands. We have to be willing and ready to be totally accountable and totally satisfied in our own minds that we have approached these problems practically and reasonably, using our best tools to solve them as effectively as we can.

SREB has been a bright spot in the lives of many people. The regional concept is so healthy, so natural, such a part of the substance that makes this country what it is. We're using the regional concept in our state. We've divided it into nine multi-county, regional development districts for the purpose of uniting in the approach to solutions of problems of mutual interest because of location and environment.

We can do the same thing in education on a larger scale. I think we can go far beyond that as long as we continue to be aware of the freedom to exercise our own judgment and experience in approaching problems beyond the boundaries of our state, problems that go beyond the field of higher education.

I respect you and congratulate you for your association with SREB. I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to come, and I leave you on one more optimistic note.

There never was a country in this world which has more with which to work, that had a greater pride in its record up to date and which, with pride in that record, can move into the future confident that we can meet any problem as long as we communicate and continue in close association. The kind of association represented by SREB.

Roster of Delegates

Arkansas

Representative Cecil L. Alexander
Heber Springs

Senator John F. Bearden
Leachville

Senator Clarence E. Bell
Parkin

Representative Ray S. Smith, Jr.
Hot Springs

Senator Bill H. Walmsley
Batesville

Florida

Representative William C. Andrews
Gainesville

Representative William R. Conway
Ormond Beach

Representative Ander Crenshaw
Jacksonville

Representative Vince Fechtel, Jr.
Leesburg

Representative Mattox Hair
Jacksonville

Representative Barry Kutun
Miami Beach

Senator Philip D. Lewis
Riviera Beach

Representative Kenneth H. MacKay, Jr.
Ocala

Representative C. William Nelson
Melbourne

Representative T. Terrell Sessums
Tampa

Senator Bruce A. Smathers
Jacksonville

Representative Eric Smith
Jacksonville

Georgia

Senator Hugh A. Carter
Plains

Senator Bert Hamilton
Macon

Senator Pierre Howard, Jr.
Decatur

Representative Hugh S. Jordan
Stone Mountain

Representative Nathan G. Knight
Newnan

Representative Sidney J. Marcus
Atlanta

Representative Chappelle Matthews
Athens

Louisiana

Representative George C. Connor, Jr.
New Orleans

Senator Frederick L. Eagan
New Orleans

Representative J. Kenneth Leithman
Gretna

Representative Jimmy D. Long
Natchitoches

Senator Donald W. Williamson
Vivian

Mississippi

Senator William B. Alexander
Cleveland

Senator James E. Bost
Ecru

Representative Bill R. Gibson
Bruce

Representative Horace H. Harned, Jr.
Starkville

Senator M. Ebb Horton
Louisville

Representative Hainon A. Miller
Greenville

Senator Jack N. Tucker
Tunica

Senator Berta Lee White
Bailey

North Carolina

Senator Robert J. Barker
Apex

Senator J. Russell Kirby
Wilson

Representative Edward L. Powell
Winston-Salem

Representative Dwight W. Quinn
Kannapolis

Senator Kennedy H. Sharpe
Hiddenite

Senator Thomas E. Strickland
Goldsboro

Representative G. Hunter Warlick
Hickory

South Carolina

Representative Harold D. Breazeale
Pickens

Cyril B. Busbee
Superintendent of Education
Columbia

Senator John Drummond
Greenwood

Representative Jack S. Garrett, Jr.
Travelers Rest

Representative F. Hall Yarborough
Orangeburg

Tennessee

Representative Robert J. Bible
Kingsport

Representative John T. Bragg
Murfreesboro

Representative Kenneth W. Crocker
Bradford

Representative Bob Davis
Chattanooga

Senator Leonard C. Dunavant
Millington

Senator Halbert Harvill
Clarksville

Representative Brad Martin
Memphis

Senator Vernon Neal
Cookeville

Texas

Representative Roy Blake
Nacogdoches

Representative L. Dean Cobb
Dumas

Representative W. G. Coody
Weatherford

Representative Joe C. Hanna
Breckenridge

Representative John Poerner
Hondo

Senator W. E. Snelson
Midland

Virginia

Senator H. Dunlop Dawbarn
Waynesboro

Delegate Ray L. Garland
Roanoke

Senator Frederick T. Gray
Chester

Senator Paul W. Manns
Bowling Green

Delegate William P. Robinson
Norfolk

Senator Edward E. Willey
Richmond

West Virginia

Delegate Calvin A. Calendine
Parkersburg

Senator Chester R. Hubbard
Wheeling

Delegate G. Michele Prestera
Huntington

Delegate Larry D. Swann
Salem